

CASES REPORTED THIS WEEK.

Alliance Supply Stores (Limited).....	796	Longbottom v. Woodhead	796
Browne v. La Trinidad (Limited).....	796	Macnary, Re, Tipper v. Tipper	796
and Others	796	Plake v. Hall	796
Fansett, Re, Wells v. Dearle	797	Walter Lowe, Re	797

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, OCTOBER 22, 1887.

CURRENT TOPICS.

DURING THE MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, which extend over fifty-one working days, Mr. Justice CHITTY will only be able to devote nine days to the hearing of witness causes, and Mr. Justice NORTH eleven days. It cannot be said that this gives any great prospect of reducing the lists of these two learned judges.

THE APPEAL LIST contains 74 appeals from the Chancery Division; 7 from the County Palatine Court; 91 from the Queen's Bench Division; 5 from the Probate Division; and 11 Bankruptcy appeals, making a total of 188 appeals. The total number, a year ago, was 204.

THE CAUSE LISTS of the Chancery Division, which we print elsewhere, contain 140 causes, &c., set down before Mr. Justice KAY, 198 before Mr. Justice CHITTY, 213 before Mr. Justice NORTH, 192 before Mr. Justice STIRLING, and 102 before Mr. Justice KNEEWICH—making a total of 845. Last sittings the total was 786; and a year ago, 795.

Mr. FULTON's Bill "to limit the powers of the water companies to cut off the tenants' water supply where the rate is paid by the landlord" became law last session (50 & 51 Vict. c. 21); and in spite of the appeal we made (*ante*, p. 247) to the lawyers in the House with regard to the proposal of the Bill to create charges on property practically undiscoverable, or discoverable only at much trouble, by a purchaser, nothing seems to have been done, and section 4 provides that "where the owner, and not the occupier, is liable by law or by agreement with the water company to the payment of the water rate" arrears of water rate payable by the owner of a dwelling-house "shall, together with interest thereon at the rate of £5 per centum per annum, computed from the expiration of one month from the time when the same has been claimed by the company until receipt thereof by the company, be a charge on such dwelling-house in priority to all other charges affecting the premises." The result of this enactment will be that wherever a dwelling-house of not exceeding the annual value of £10 (in respect whereof the owner is, under the Waterworks Clauses Act, 1847, s. 72, liable to the water rate) is being purchased or mortgaged, inquiry will have to be made, on behalf of the purchaser or mortgagee, whether the vendor is in arrear with his water rate. The only effectual mode of making this inquiry will be to address it to the water company's collector, but it seems doubtful whether he will trouble to reply to a question which he is not bound to answer. What will a purchaser say if his solicitor should overlook the existence of section 4 of 50 & 51 Vict. c. 21, and after the completion of his purchase he finds that the water company are first mortgagees of the property for the amount of considerable arrears of water rate and interest thereon?

THE MITCHELSTOWN VERDICT, and the proceedings of which it was the climax, have drawn attention to the subject of setting aside coroners' inquisitions. We print elsewhere a letter which Mr. HERBERT STEPHEN has written on the subject, and which, it is not improbable, may express the views of a very high authority. We may add to what is there said, that the proceedings before a coroner are not invalidated by slight irregularities, provided those do not substantially affect the proceedings. Thus, in *Reg. v. Bingham* (8 B. & S. 257) the court declined to interfere on the ground that evidence not upon oath had been received, and also on the ground of misdirection of the coroner to the jury, and of the

verdict being unsupported by the evidence. This apparently was on the ground that the coroner's inquisition is not final. As to misconduct of the coroner, there are two good cases not quoted by Mr. STEPHEN. One is *R. v. Wakefield* (1 Strange, 68), where the coroner induced the jury, who were convinced that a man who had hanged himself was insane, to return a verdict of *felo de se*, assuring them it would have the same effect. The other is *R. v. Stukely* (12 Mod. 498), where the coroner, wishing to get a verdict of insanity, but, finding the evidence of *felo de se* very strong, excluded some of the jury. In this case a criminal information was granted against the coroner and a new inquest ordered. The difficulty about a new inquest is that it must be *super visum corporis*, and held by the coroner who has misconducted himself; but the difficulty is overcome by applying for a *melius inquirendum*. The best statement of the law upon this subject is contained in *R. v. Bunney* (1 B. & C. 190): "If a coroner's inquest be quashed, the coroner must take a new inquest *super visum corporis*; but if a *melius inquirendum* be granted on a *male se gessit* of the coroner; the new inquiry must be before the sheriff or commissioners, not *super visum corporis*, but upon affidavits; for none but the coroner can inquire *super visum corporis*, and he is not to be trusted again."

THE PARTIAL ASSIMILATION of the law of real estate to that of personal estate proposed in the Lord Chancellor's Land Transfer Bill of last session forms the subject of an interesting article by Mr. M. H. BOX in the current number of the *Law Quarterly Review*, in which he maintains that no change of the law in the above direction can be satisfactory unless it involves the effacement of the distinction between the two classes of property. In support of this he shows, by numerous examples, how the destination of property often depends upon artificial rules of law of which a testator has no suspicion, and how it may even be altered at the will of a third party after his death. This often happens in cases of vendors and purchasers by reason of the equitable effect of a contract upon the nature of the property. Thus, if a vendor depending the completion of the contract, and it subsequently appears that the contract can be enforced only against him and not by him, it depends solely upon the purchaser whether the heir shall retain the property as land or whether it shall go to the personal representatives as money. So, too, there is much confusion as to the rights of the heir and the executor of a mortgagee who has foreclosed and then died, if the foreclosure should be subsequently opened at the instance of the mortgagor. Other examples are taken from the option to purchase often given to a lessee; from the relation of landlord and tenant; and from the rules as to partnership property; and it is shown, too, how in the administration of estates both the creditors and the beneficiaries in the personal estate have much to complain of. It is very desirable that such changes in our law as were proposed by the Lord Chancellor's Bill should be worked out with minute attention to details, and we think that Mr. BOX has done well in calling attention to the subject.

THE STRANGE CONFUSION which (as the recent case of *Re Whistler*, 35 Ch. D. 558, shows) has arisen with regard to the application of the rule in *Re Tinqueray-Willams and Landau* (30 W. R. 801, 20 Ch. D. 465), is probably due in part to the insertion, in the last edition of Lewin on Trusts, in the midst of a paragraph relating to executors' receipts, of the statement "but the rule has been now adopted that after twenty years it is fair to presume that the debts have been paid, and the onus is on the executors to show that such is not the case." The obvious meaning of this passage, considered in relation to its context, is that after twenty years from the testator's death a purchaser from executors of the leaseholds or other personal property of the testator is put upon inquiry as to whether any debts exist. This doctrine, which was boldly contended for in *Re Whistler*, would have been an inroad on the executor's power, for which, so far as we are aware, not a particle of support exists in the older authorities, and which is utterly opposed to the spirit of the modern cases. The general nature of the executor's power over the personal property of his testator was never better stated than by Lord MANSFIELD in *Whale v. Booth* (4 T. R. 625, note (a)):—

"The general rule both of law and equity is clear, that an executor may dispose of the assets of the testator; that over them he has absolute power; and that they cannot be followed by the testator's creditors. It would be monstrous if it were otherwise; for then no one would deal with an executor. . . . It is also clear that if at the time of alienation the purchaser knows they are assets, this is no evidence of fraud; for all the testator's debts may have been already satisfied; or if he knows that the debts are not all satisfied, must he look to the application of the money? No one would buy on such terms." And, as Lord HATHERLEY, C., said in *Charlton v. Earl of Durham* (17 W. R. 995, 4 Ch. 434): "The persons with whom the executors are dealing are not bound to know the state of the testator's assets, and it may be many years before all his debts are paid and his estate wound up." "In many respects and for many purposes," said Sir W. GRANT, M.R., in *Hill v. Simpson* (7 Ves. 166), "third persons are entitled to consider them [i.e., executors] absolute owners. . . . The power of disposition is generally incident, being frequently necessary; and a stranger shall not be put to examine whether in the particular instance that power has been discreetly exercised." There is nothing in *Re Tanqueray-Williams and Landau* to support the notion that any restriction on the power of executors to deal with the personal estate was intended. That was a case where executors in whom the legal fee was vested were selling real estate charged with debts, and, of course, the observations in the judgments must be taken to refer to the case before the court. The object was to afford a rule in cases where a power of sale for payment of debts is given over real estate; and the rule laid down was that a purchaser under such a power after more than twenty years from the testator's death is bound to inquire whether debts have been paid. As Mr. Justice KAY observed in *Re Whistler*, there is a wide difference between a mere power of sale for the payment of debts and the right given by law to the executor to deal with assets vested in him in that character. The executor has not merely to pay debts; he may have to pay expenses of administration and to raise money by mortgage of the testator's estate; and for these purposes it is essential that he should retain the power of dealing with the testator's assets.

A CURIOUS QUESTION was raised in *Re Jackson* (35 W. R. 646) with regard to the old joint account clause inserted in mortgages. Does it operate only as between the mortgagor and the mortgagees, or does it alter the rights of the latter *inter se*? Three sisters advanced, on various mortgages of real estate, moneys forming part of the proceeds of sale of their brother's residuary estate, to which they were entitled as tenants in common. The mortgages were taken (apparently for the convenience of the mortgagors) in the names of the sisters as joint tenants, and in each mortgage deed an ordinary joint account clause was inserted. After the death of all the sisters the question was raised, in an action for the administration of the estate of one of them, whether the insertion of the joint account clause was sufficient to countervail the equitable rule that money jointly advanced belongs to the lenders as tenants in common. The chief clerk held that it did; Mr. Justice NORTH held that it did not; but the decision of the learned judge appears to have rested on the evidence which was adduced of the intention of the lenders. The question would have been a serious one if the clause were still inserted, or if any doubt were left on the subject in the substituted provisions of the Conveyancing Act, 1881. Fortunately, however, section 61 expressly provides that "the mortgage-money . . . shall be deemed to be and remain money belonging to those persons on a joint account, as between them and the mortgagor." And we apprehend that this is the true interpretation of the old clause, and that Mr. Justice NORTH might have found in the general rule for the construction of deeds laid down in *Bold v. Atolinsus* (Dyer, 16a), and confirmed in *Ros v. Hayley* (12 East, 464)—viz., that "in every deed a reasonable intention shall be construed, although the words sound to a contrary meaning"—a reason for construing the clause as applying only as between mortgagor and mortgagee.

THE AUTHORITIES at the Treasury who compile the judicial statistics are not yet aware that petitions in the Chancery Division are no longer presented at "the Rolls." In their return it is stated

that "the proceedings in the office of the chancery registrars and the other business transacted at the Rolls" are shown in Table 4. On reference to Table 4 nothing is found to warrant this statement. On the contrary, the table shews, in accordance with fact, that the whole of the petitions are presented at the registrar's office.

IN THE BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS just issued it appears that there were 4,170 cases of bankruptcy in 1884, 4,333 in 1885, and 4,816 in 1886, which shews an increase of 646 cases in the three years. On the other hand, the estimated deficiency on these estates decreased from £9,973,997 in 1884 to £5,058,711 in 1886; while the percentage of assets to liabilities on the debtors' statements increased from 28·7 to 36·1.

VENDOR'S LIABILITY FOR DETERIORATION OF THE PURCHASED PROPERTY.

THE elementary rule as to the rights and liabilities of vendor and purchaser of real estate in the interval between contract and completion was laid down by Sir T. Plumer, V.C., in *Harford v. Purrier* (1 Madd. 532), as follows:—"The estate is considered as belonging to the purchaser from the date of the contract, and the money from that time as belonging to the vendor, . . . the consequence is that if, after the contract, the estate be improved in the interval, or if the value be lessened by the failure of tenants or otherwise, and no fault on either side, the vendee has the benefit or sustains the loss." Familiar instances of the application of this general rule are the destruction by fire of buildings on the purchased property, in which case the vendor is not liable to the purchaser, even though he has allowed the insurance to expire on the day originally fixed for completion, without notice to the purchaser (*Paine v. Meller*, 6 Ves. 349), and the accidental fall of part of the buildings, in which case, if the vendor is under a legal obligation to rebuild, the remainder of the buildings being dangerous, the purchaser is bound to indemnify him against his outlay: *Robertson v. Skelton* (12 Beav. 260). The difficulty has always arisen with regard to the scope to be given to the words in the above extract which we have placed in italics. When is a vendor in fault? or, in other words, what are the duties of the vendor in possession to the purchaser with regard to the property sold, and when do these duties come to an end?

The doctrine that a vendor is liable for deterioration of the property sold, arising, not merely from his wilful waste, but also from his negligence—as, for instance, from his allowing fences to get out of repair or the land to remain uncultivated—was laid down in *Foster v. Deacon* (3 Madd. 394), decided two years after *Harford v. Purrier*, and was fully established by subsequent cases (see *Ferguson v. Tadman*, 1 Sim. 530; *Regent's Canal Co. v. Ware*, 23 Beav. 575; *Thomas v. Buxton*, 8 Eq. 120). The language of the earlier cases clearly implied that it was the duty of the vendor to re-let the land sold on a yearly tenancy, so as to prevent it from going out of cultivation; and this was subsequently expressly laid down by Jessel, M.R., in *Earl of Egmont v. Smith* (6 Ch. D. 469). The duty of the vendor, he said, "is to let the farms from year to year in order to obtain a sufficient rent and to keep the farms in a good state of cultivation."

Whether the vacancy happen in the ordinary course of determining the tenancy either by the landlord or the tenant, or whether the vacancy happens because the landlord gave the notice at the request of the purchaser, appears to me, as regards the subsequent liability, wholly immaterial. But there is no hint to be found in the earlier cases of any liability on the vendor greater than that resulting from an obligation to take reasonable care of the property, so that the purchaser may obtain it in the condition in which he agreed to buy it. And it was considered to be also settled that this liability of the vendor was restricted to deterioration occurring before the time fixed for completion or the time at which the title shewn was such that the purchaser ought to have taken possession: *Binks v. Lord Rokby* (2 Swanst. 222); *Minekin v. Nance* (4 Beav. 332). "As to deterioration after he took possession, or after there was a title under which he might take possession," said Lord Eldon in *Binks v. Lord Rokby* (p. 226), "the purchaser cannot have an allowance in respect of that."

So matters remained from 1818 to 1872. But in the latter year there occurred the decision of *Phillips v. Sylvester* (21 W. R. 179, 8 Ch. 173). In that case there had been nearly six years' delay in completion, admittedly solely attributable to the purchaser, who had wrongly claimed a small piece of land as included in the purchase contract. There was no question as to the title, but the vendor had (as he was entitled to do) refused to give possession of the property until the purchase-money was paid; and, in the meantime, he had allowed the property to remain unlet and entirely neglected. It was held by Lord Selborne that, although the delay in completion was solely due to the purchaser, and although the vendor, in refusing to give up possession, was acting within his right, yet he was liable to the purchaser for the amount of rent which might have been received, and for the deterioration which had occurred in the property. The grounds of the decision were these:—By the effect of the purchase contract the right to the property passes to the purchaser; the right of the vendor is turned into a right to receive the purchase-money, for which he has a lien on the land until the purchase-money is paid. He is therefore in the same position as "any other person would be, who, having security on land, insisted on the possession of the land as further security." That is to say, the vendor who retains possession until completion does so in the character of mortgagee in possession. It may, we think, be safely said that up to this decision no one had dreamt of ascribing this character to the possession of the vendor. In *Sherwin v. Shakespear* (5 De G. M. & G. 517) it was expressly decided by the Lords Justices that a vendor who has to account to a purchaser for rents and profits from the time fixed for completion is not, unless a special case be made, liable to account for sums which he might have received but for his wilful default, nor entitled to an inquiry as to repairs or lasting improvements. "There is a vast distinction," said Lord Justice Turner (p. 536), "between the position of a vendor and that of a mortgagee who enters into possession of the estate. The mortgagee, when he enters, enters under a condition imposed on him by this court of exercising the utmost diligence for the benefit of himself and the mortgagor; but in the case of a vendor, the vendor does not take, but remains in, possession of the estate. It may ultimately appear that the estate of which he is in possession may never become the estate of the purchaser at all; and I think that if he continues in the due and ordinary course of management it is not the course of this court to charge him, upon the principle of his having been converted into the position of a mortgagee for the purchase-money." This was the law as understood by one of the most accurate and careful judges who ever sat on the bench; and it will be seen that it is in direct conflict with the singular doctrine laid down by Lord Selborne. It appears, moreover, from Mr. Justice Kekewich's valuable and interesting judgment in the recent case of *Royal Bristol Permanent Building Society v. Bomash* (35 Ch. D. 390) that, on *Phillips v. Sylvester* subsequently coming before Sir George Jessel, M.R., on further consideration, that eminent judge expressed a strong disapproval of Lord Selborne's decision, and that the well-known passage in 2 Dart's V. & P. (5th ed.) 650, in which the decision is severely criticized, had the approval of the late Master of the Rolls. Mr. Justice Kekewich in the recent case expressed an opinion that this criticism was sound; and we trust it may be anticipated that the strange notion that a vendor remaining in possession under any circumstances is in the position of a mortgagee in possession, will be discarded.

The true position of the vendor retaining possession was laid down by the House of Lords in *Shaw v. Foster* (L. R. 5 H. L. 321), where Lord Cairns said that "the vendor was a trustee of the property for the purchaser; the purchaser was the real beneficial owner, in the eye of a court of equity, of the property, subject only to this observation, that the vendor was not a mere dormant trustee; he was a trustee having a personal and substantial interest in the property; a right to protect that interest and an active right to assert that interest if anything should be done in derogation of it." In other words, the vendor is, as Sir G. Jessel said in *Earl of Egmont v. Smith* (*ubi supra*), "a trustee, no doubt with peculiar duties and liabilities, but he is a trustee." His peculiar duties appear to consist in taking reasonable care that the property sold does not suffer serious deterioration, either, in the case of land, from the destruction of the fences or non-cultivation; or, in the case of buildings,

from lack of repair, or (as Mr. Justice Kekewich said in *Royal Bristol Permanent Building Society v. Bomash*) from damage done by a tenant on the removal of fixtures, or from the breaking of windows or anything of that kind.

But on the question at what time does the vendor's liability cease, we are left very much in the dark by the recent case. If the words of the judgment in *Phillips v. Sylvester* are to be followed, it continues so long as the vendor, under any circumstances, remains in possession of the property sold. But in that case the vendor refused to give possession to the purchaser. In the recent case the purchaser refused to take possession, or enter into receipt of rents, until the vendors could give vacant possession, but, as Mr. Justice Kekewich held that the vendors had contracted to give vacant possession, they were in default, and the purchaser was justified in his refusal. It seems to us that no case has yet decided that a vendor's liability continues after he has shewn a good title according to the conditions of sale, and has offered to give possession to the purchaser; and we think that where completion is likely to be delayed owing to questions not relating to the title, the safe course for the vendor is to offer to give such possession or receipt of rent as may be stipulated for in the purchase agreement.

IS COMPULSION REALLY NECESSARY FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF REGISTRATION OF TITLE?

II.

In our last article we reminded our readers of the ill-success of the Act of 1862, and how that had given rise to a suspicion of the selfish opposition of solicitors, and a surmise that the failure of the Act was mainly due to that cause. We also shewed that the best possible judges—namely, the Royal Commissioners of 1868—after giving the matter their very serious attention, entirely acquitted the profession of all blame. We consider this to have a direct bearing on the subject before us—"whether compulsion be really necessary?"—because, as will afterwards appear, we find the principal strength of the demand for compulsion, even at the present day, rests on the ground of this mistrust of solicitors as a body, and so no inquiry into the validity of that demand can possibly be of the slightest value which does not give full weight to this aspect of the matter.

After proving that the solicitors were not the cause of the failure of the Act of 1862, the commissioners proceed to say what, in their opinion, the causes were. The two main causes they mention are, *first*, that the avenue to the register was practically closed to the majority of landowners by the difficulty of proving a perfect title; and, *second*, that the system pursued in registering subsequent dealings was too complicated to give satisfaction to even the small number of landowners who succeeded in navigating their estates over the formidable "harbour bar" just mentioned.

To remedy the first difficulty the report (paragraph 75) advised the species of registration now known as "Possessory Title," and for the second (paragraph 72) that the system of registration pursued should be limited to registering fee simples and leaseholds, so as to enable the practice to be assimilated more closely to that already in operation in the Register of Stock. Both of these suggestions were, in fact, carried out by the subsequent Act of 1875.

The question of compulsion was not mooted before the commissioners, nor is it mentioned in their report, but it appears to have been a not infrequent concomitant of schemes for registration of possessory title ever since their first appearance. This will be seen from considering the history of the idea of possessory title, which is as follows:—

The name is not a very fortunate one; it expresses rather the nature of the evidence on which the registration is to take place than the nature of the registration when made. Mr. R. Wilson, a London solicitor, expounded it in 1847 to the Registration and Conveyancing Commission (Report, 1850), illustrating it with some 200 pages of forms which he had prepared for the purpose, and which are bound up with the report. Paragraph 639 of the evidence runs, "Then your first step would be to have a compulsory registration, in each parish, of the ownership of all the properties? Exactly so." The registration referred to was to be called "provisional registration" (a far better name than "possessory"), and was to remain provisional until the expiration of a

given period (not unlike the Chancery's five years for "confirmation," only at that early period ten or twenty years (paragraph 650) was the time suggested for maturing the title), and the evidence was to be possession only (Evidence, page 485). The commissioners, in their report (page 36), abstain from comment on this plan, because it appeared to them to alter existing titles, "to change the character of existing rights and to shorten the periods during which they might be asserted," matters which it was not within their commission to treat.

In the report of the next commission, however—the Registration of Title Commission—published in 1857, the question is definitely discussed. In paragraph XLVII., page 26, of the report, five different sorts of compulsion are stated and considered:—

- (1.) To oblige all owners to make their claims within a given time, on pain of losing their lands should another be registered owing to such default;
- (2.) (Apparently) To have a general inquiry into all titles, and to register (only) such as were proved sound;
- (3.) To make registration an essential requisite to the legal completion of any transfer;
- (4.) To render it conclusive as to priority of rival claims in cases of conflict.

For various reasons, most of which have since become the common property of all disputants on the subject, the commissioners declined to recommend the adoption of any of the above modes of compulsion, though not without some difference of opinion as to the last.

- (5.) To require that properties once voluntarily registered should not be taken off the register. This they recommend.

As regards the general question, they propose (paragraphs I.V. to LXI., pages 33 to 35) that "registration of title should be twofold—one which shall at once enable the registered owner to transfer the estate with a present or immediate statutory title; the other, registration of actual ownership without the power to transfer an immediate statutory title"—possessory title in short. Only the former of these was, in fact, embodied in either of the two Bills introduced into Parliament in 1859, or in the measure adopted by the Legislature in 1862.

Then came the failure of the Act of 1862 (already commented on), which resulted (as we have seen) in the re-appearance of the two-fold system recommended in 1857. It is evident, however, from the language of the Report of 1870 (paragraph 74) that the commissioners then placed much more reliance on the still untried expedient of possessory title than on the absolute title system whose fruits had been so scanty. In fact, it was evidently thought that absolute titles could never be granted on terms short of exorbitant, and so, official assistance having failed to create the ease and security ultimately aimed at, the assistance of old Father Time was called in instead. To a possessory title "lapse of time will confer an ever-increasing validity till it becomes marketable in the technical sense and practically indefeasible," and then follows the now classical "filter" metaphor. "It is as though a filter were placed athwart a muddy stream; the water above remains muddy, but below it is clear, and, when you get so far down the stream as never to have occasion to ascend above the filter, it is the same thing as though the stream was clear from its source" (Report of 1870, paragraph 75, page xxviii.).

Well would it have been for "possessory title" and all concerned it had this simple principle been relied on in its integrity. Unfortunately, among one or two other mistakes which we shall point out further on, it was thought advisable (if we may continue the metaphor) to do a little preliminary dredging above the filter, in the shape of requiring "as a precaution against the entry of a purely fictitious title" (Report, paragraph 76), the making of a preliminary investigation which, in the practice under the resulting Act, took shape in the making of certain affidavits, the production of the last conveyance, and (presumably) its perusal, and the consideration of the question whether, by stamping certain deeds produced, the fact of the registration could or could not be concealed from a person dealing with the land. What harm (except to the applicant himself) the registration of a purely fictitious title could do is not apparent: nothing was to be guaranteed, so nothing would be assumed from it by purchasers. This left-handed investigation had no effect whatever in clearing the title, and the amount of trouble it involved, or appeared capable of involving,

operated as a most decided check upon landowners adopting the system.

To return to the facts. Although the Commissioners' Report of 1870 did not even suggest compulsion, although the Report of 1857 had expressly disapproved of it, and although no really efficient reason had as yet been propounded for recourse to such an expedient, other than the perhaps natural desire of the reformer to have the fulfilment of his project guaranteed by sovereign authority, Lord Selborne, in 1874, thought the compulsory registration of possessory titles on all sales would be a justifiable provision, and accordingly included it in his Bill of that year. But Lord Cairns was of another opinion (which he always afterwards maintained, even in the face of the failure of his own Act), and, accordingly, the Act of 1875 was voluntary, like its predecessor.

The failure of the Act of 1875, however, raised a fresh difficulty, and was marked by a reappearance of the old suspicion. The report of Mr. Osborne Morgan's Committee of 1878, 1879, does not endorse that suspicion in any way, but it contains the following passage, which, in the present state of the public mind on the subject, is next door to admitting the necessity of compulsion:—"Rightly or wrongly, the public or their professional advisers have deliberately made up their minds that the advantages offered by the new system of registration are too speculative and remote to compensate for the immediate and certain outlay and trouble which are inseparable from it. . . (page v.). They are informed, on the authority of Mr. Follett and Mr. Holt, that no system of registration of titles can be devised which will be voluntarily adopted" (page iv.). The committee then deprecate compulsion on general grounds, and go on to record their opinion that improvements in conveyancing must be sought in other expedients. Our own belief is that the failure of the Act of 1875 was principally owing to the apathy shewn by all high personages in relation to the matter from the moment the Act was passed down to about this time last year. If the "possessory title" system had been properly (or at all) advertised, and if the approaches to the register had been made in the least easy, if local solicitors had been appointed agents of the office, &c., matters would probably by this time have been very different. Lord Thring's evidence given to Mr. O. Morgan's Committee tends to support this view. "First, I consider the passing of Lord Westbury's Act threw a blight over the whole thing; then the feeling of the profession is a very conservative one; it is very difficult to move, and the dead weight of an opposition of that sort is very great" (this we have never disputed); "and, lastly, the public are not acquainted with the provisions of the Act; or, in other words, it has not been properly advertised or made public."

I told the Government that I was certain the other Act had thrown a sort of blight upon the whole system, and that unless unusual exertions were used it would not be taken advantage of. . . . Probably there ought to be in the larger places agencies. . . . If it were pushed in the way you or I or a company would push anything we were concerned in, I think it would succeed" (1879, Evidence, paragraphs 7, 8, 25, 67).

Meanwhile a new element was exerting a marked and powerful influence on the minds of the commercial community—who have a very direct interest in land as a marketable commodity, and as a security for debts and engagements—namely, the success of the Torrens system in Australasia. Untaught to observe the great differences between the Torrens and the Westbury-Cairns system which subsequent study has brought to light, the general public has come to the conclusion that the Act of 1875 cannot have had fair play, or else it would have succeeded as the Colonial Acts have.

The subject passed for a time out of the hands of the landowners themselves into those of speculative politicians, whose study and experience are seldom equal to their enthusiasm and self-confidence, and among these there can be no doubt that the demand for compulsion is most determined, and is founded on the impression (which has much plausibility at first sight) that nothing else will do the necessary work of overcoming professional opposition and prejudice.

Thus it is in vain that it has been urged that solicitors opposed registration in Australia quite as much as they are supposed to have—and more than they are proved to have—opposed it in England; in vain is the absurdity pointed out of supposing that, if a really cheap and easy system had been suitably presented to the landowners, the opposition of all the solicitors in the world

would have sufficed to prevent their availing themselves of it. The multitude cannot be expected to recognize fine distinctions; their minds seem almost unalterably made up.

For various reasons, however, the accusation against solicitors (without which the argument for compulsion is robbed of half its force) has been withdrawn to some extent. Respect for the opinion which has prevailed with all the Royal Commissions and Parliamentary Committees that have considered the matter has prevented the responsible leaders of the two great parties in the State from basing their claim for compulsion on this ground. Compulsion appears to them to be defensible and necessary mainly for another reason, to be noticed next—namely, that registration is so remote a benefit that it is not to be expected that any present generation of landowners should voluntarily adopt it. But when this is considered carefully, it will not appear to present registration in a very attractive light, or to account for the fact that compulsory registration is at present such a popular cry as it is. We venture to think that, while the leaders are moved by this conviction, their supporters are still actuated by the suspicion of solicitors which we have seen to be widely diffused, and perhaps pardonable as an error of the ignorant.

To turn to the view now propounded by the great leaders in the matter, it amounts to this: No means yet devised will place an absolute title within the reach of an ordinary landowner; possessory title, therefore, is the only resource. But possessory title confers no benefit upon the existing generation of landowners; therefore, it is useless to expect them voluntarily to adopt it; if it is to be established at all, it must be by compulsion; landowners must submit to a burden they would never willingly undertake, in consideration of the benefit to posterity. A more unfortunate statement can hardly be conceived. If it be true, heavy compensation out of the public funds ought to be made to the present generation of landowners for their trouble and inconvenience. No sign of the intention to make such compensation is apparent. If it be not true, then, again arises the old question, Why should a well-educated class of men need to be compelled to do what is for their own benefit, or even (in reason) for the benefit of their children?

REVIEWS.

MODERN EQUITY.

LEADING CASES IN MODERN EQUITY. By THOMAS BRETT, LL.B., B.A., Barrister-at-law. William Clowes & Sons (Limited).

Let us say at once that Mr. Brett's book is an interesting one. It is interesting because it sets forth concisely a number of decisions of recent years which to a large extent replace those of a previous date, and these are followed by short essays on the points of law involved. It affords the reader a good deal of information, while it saves him the long arguments and judgments of the cases in White and Tudor, with the formidable treatises appended to each.

But we doubt whether Mr. Brett has made the book as useful as he might have done. What we really want in our law is systematic exposition, and here we have nothing of the kind. Of course it would be wrong to judge any book by a higher standard than that which it aims at, and if the object is merely to give a number of detached decisions, the author is quite at liberty to confine himself to this. But he ought, in that case, to refrain from enlarging the book by a quantity of miscellaneous information which can only be really useful when properly arranged. Thus the note to *Richards v. Delbridge* (p. 8) on Declaration of Trust, which is introduced to shew how a voluntary gift or settlement can be validly made, finishes up with a list of persons who may be trustees and with the sections of the Conveyancing Act on the appointment of trustees. So in the note to *Re Jones* (p. 149), which decides that a person may be tenant for life under the Settled Land Act, 1882, though he receives no income from the land, we have the outline of a treatise on the whole of the Act.

Indeed, the book gives us not so much leading decisions in modern equity as a great quantity of information on the law relating to cases now assigned to the Chancery Division, and that quite regardless of whether they illustrate equitable doctrines or no. We have already referred to *Re Jones*, which is a case on the construction of the Settled Land Act. We may also refer to *Reid v. Reid* (p. 142) on the Married Women's Property Act, 1882. Both of these are highly important and interesting cases, but it is difficult to see their connection with modern equity. The same may be said of the practice cases at the end of the book. Moreover, as Mr. Brett was really dealing with Chancery business, we might

have expected some decisions on company law, and here, although it depends so largely on statute, he would have found that modern equity had really been at work. Thus quite a new importance has been given recently to the possession of share certificates, and the case of *Société Générale de Paris v. Walker* (11 App. Cas. 20) might well have been introduced under this head. But where the field for selection is so wide, it is clearly invidious to complain of the omission of particular cases. Let us rather say that the cases which are introduced are really leading cases, and that where the author has confined his notes to discussions of the real point involved he frequently gives us a valuable account of the development of the law. Thus, in *Austerberry v. Corporation of Oldham*, the manner in which the equitable doctrine of notice has been applied to restrictive covenants, is well worked out. Many other examples of this could be quoted, as in the quite recent cases of *National Provincial Bank of England v. Games* (31 Ch. D. 582), on mortgagees' costs, and *Re Corsellis* (34 Ch. D. 675), on solicitor-trustees' costs.

There is, indeed, as we said before, plenty of useful matter in the book. What we complain of is, that the author has not rightly apprehended the limits of his subject. If he meant to give us a handy volume on modern decisions in equity, he should have reduced the number of his cases, made his notes somewhat fuller on the particular points involved, and cut off the miscellaneous matter. While, if he meant to produce a work on the law as applied in the Chancery Division, he ought to have given up the idea of leading cases altogether, and attempted a systematic arrangement.

LAND TRANSFER.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE LAND TRANSFER BILL, 1887. By JOHN BRENNAN, Solicitor. Waterlow & Sons (Limited).

This pamphlet is based on letters which have appeared in the columns of the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL. The author is opposed to every item contained in the Land Transfer Bill. He distrusts registration of title altogether, and sees no necessity for the changes in the law of real property. The keynote of the whole is sounded in the following passage (at p. 11):—"Thanks to the admirable Act of 1881, conveyancing has been brought to such a state of extreme simplicity that improvement might well be regarded as impossible; and the authorized scale of charges appears to give general satisfaction, as well to clients as to practitioners. The Settled Land Act of 1882, by the powers conferred on the tenant for life, effected a very valuable alteration, and got rid of the popular objection that land was too much tied up." We think, for reasons which we explained last week, that the discussion of the general objections to registration of title as a whole is now almost futile. Both the great parties in the State are pledged to it, and all that remains for the profession is to make the best they can of the position. But there will be found in Mr. Brennan's pamphlet some new and valuable suggestions against the real property clauses of the Bill, based upon the variable character of the value of land. It is suggested that in view of the general decline in the value of land, this is not a proper moment to place it on a par with Consols and railway shares in the order of administration.

On several points connected with the debatable points in the registration system proposed by the Bill, Mr. Brennan is in accord with the general opinion expressed by professional critics who have gone minutely into the matter. He very reasonably asks for a probationary period of six years before the incidence of compulsion; he dwells upon the difference between Consols and real estate; sees no advantage in a possessory title, and sees considerable blemishes in the absolute title now proposed to be established, as not being truly indefeasible. Consolidation with the Act of 1875 is most properly insisted on, the absence of detail is deplored, and the expense of registration to the small purchaser is set forth. The author deprecates the officialism that will ensue on the adoption of the Bill, and objects to the Insurance Fund, which he styles robbing Peter to pay Paul; on this latter point, however, we cannot concur. The regulations as to boundaries he also objects to, in which we cordially agree (see reasons *ante*, p. 559).

The *Times* Paris correspondent says that term opened in the Paris Law Courts on the 17th inst., and although attendance at the so-called "Messe Rouge" is no longer binding on the judges, there were few absentees. Archbishop Richard gave the benediction at the mass in the Sainte Chapelle, after which the courts met and the usual historical essays on legal celebrities were delivered.

A committee has been appointed by the Home Secretary to report upon the accommodation for prisoners awaiting trial at police courts and courts of petty sessions; and also on the question of providing food for destitute prisoners who are tried there. The committee consists of the Hon. Mr. Justice Wills, Sir R. Fowler, M.P., Sir T. Evans, Sir E. F. Du Cane, K.C.B., and Mr. H. J. Bushby. Mr. J. S. Sanders is appointed secretary.

CASES BEFORE THE VACATION JUDGE.

COMPANY—PETITION—CREDITORS—PRIORITY—ADVERTISEMENT—LONDON GAZETTE—NOTICE.

In the case of the *Alliance Supply Stores (Limited)*, before Charles, J., on the 14th inst., the question arose whether the petitioner presenting a second petition had notice of a petition previously presented, and whether he had any priority by virtue of his petition being advertised first in the *London Gazette*. Two petitions were presented to wind up the company, one by a creditor to the amount of £5 3s. 8d., being also a debenture holder to the amount of £300, the other by a creditor to the amount of £160. The petitions were opposed by creditors to the amount of £518, but the company consented to a winding-up order being made. For the first petition it was said that the company was insolvent, and *ex debito justitiæ* should be wound up. This petition was presented on the 21st of September, the second petition on the 23rd of September. Reference was made to the *Globe Steel Co.* (23 W. R. 823, 20 Eq. 337). Creditors opposed the petition, but the company said the business could not go on. In the cases where the creditors successfully opposed the company also opposed. Reference was made to *The Uruguay Co.* (27 W. R. 571, 11 Ch. D. 372), *Middlesborough Assembly Rooms Co.* (28 W. R. 863, 14 Ch. D. 104), *Langley Mill Steel and Ironworks Co.* (19 W. R. 674, 13 Eq. 26), *London and Suburban Bank* (19 W. R. 763, 6 Ch. 641), *Great Western Forest of Dean Coal Consumers' Co.* (30 W. R. 885, 21 Ch. D. 769), *Chapel House Colliery Co.* (31 W. R. 356, 13 Eq. 474). The company was in the nature of a partnership, and could refuse to go on. As to the petitions, this one was advertised first of the two in the *Daily Chronicle*, but the second petition was advertised first of the two in the *London Gazette*. Under the new practice it was not a question of advertisement, a second petition now could not be presented without notice of a first petition, because it was the duty of the officer of the court to search and find out whether any previous petition had been presented. For the second petitioner it was said that several bills of exchange remained due and dishonoured. The first petitioner was a small creditor and was also an officer of the company. The second petition was advertised first in the *London Gazette*. *United Ports General Insurance Co.* (20 W. R. 356, 13 Eq. 474). Creditors to the amount of £518 opposed. On their behalf it was said that the company was not insolvent; the assets consisted of 5s. uncalled capital on each £1 share, stock in trade £500, valued at £400, being originally bought for £1,800, book debts £2,500, valued at £500. These valuations were incorrect, and it had not been made out that the company was insolvent.

CHARLES, J., made one order on both petitions, and the usual order as to costs, and gave the conduct of the winding up to the petitioner who advertised first in the *London Gazette*.—COUNSEL, D. L. Alexander; B. E. Lawrence; Cooper Wyld; and Gately. SOLICITORS, K. Poulton; J. Godfrey & Hickson; Thomas Durant; and Thomas W. Hall.

ATTACHMENT—ORDER TO PAY—DISOBEDIENCE—INABILITY TO PAY—DEBTORS ACT, 1869, s. 4.

In the case of *Re Magnay, Tipper v. Tipper* before Charles, J., on the 11th inst., the question arose whether a writ of attachment should issue against the defendant for disobedience to an order made by Chitty, J., on the 3rd of August, whereby the defendant George Tipper was ordered to pay £1,304 19s. 9d. into court. In 1881 Mrs. Eloise Magnay was burnt to death in the fire at the Opera House at Nice. The defendant George Tipper, a first cousin of the deceased, who died intestate, then took out letters of administration and obtained the papers and jewellery of the intestate and a sum of £1,304 19s. 9d. The plaintiff Clara M. Tipper and a sister, both sisters of the intestate, then brought this action, and Chitty, J., on the 3rd of August, made the order above referred to, which had not been complied with. For the defendant it was contended that he could not be imprisoned since the Debtors Act, 1869. Reference was made to *Middleton v. Chichester* (19 W. R. 299, 6 Ch. 152). The proceedings had been taken four years after the defendant had received the money; he was not aware that the plaintiffs were alive, he had since done all he could to get the letters of administration revoked. If the defendant were not sent to prison he could get employment and pay off the money by instalments.

CHARLES, J., said that all the considerations urged on behalf of the defendant were very relevant to his release, but the plaintiffs were entitled to their order, the order not to be drawn up for ten days; the defendant to pay the costs.—COUNSEL, De Courcy Atkins; Cayney. SOLICITORS, Hare & Co., for C. A. Wade, Henfield, Sussex; A. T. Binning.

PARTNERSHIP—DISPUTE—RECEIVER—ASSETS IN DANGER.

In the case of *Longbottom v. Woodhead*, before Charles, J., on the 19th inst., the question arose whether, where the existence of a partnership was disputed, but the assets were in jeopardy, a receiver should be appointed. This was a motion on behalf of Messrs. Longbottom, hot water engineers, of Leeds, asking that the interim injunction granted on the 21st of September last by Charles, J., might be continued and a receiver appointed. The action was brought for an account of the moneys received by the defendant in respect of a partnership alleged to have been entered into between the plaintiffs and the defendant in January, 1876. The plaintiffs also asked for an injunction restraining the defendant from dealing with the partnership assets or pledging the credit of the partnership, and for a receiver to be appointed. The defendant denied that there was a partnership. Evidence was given that the assets were in danger. For the plaintiffs it was said that there was ample evidence that there was a partnership; the case was different from *Peacock v. Pa-*

cock (16 Ves. 49). Here the assets were in jeopardy, and the plaintiffs were entitled to have the interim injunction continued, and to have a receiver appointed. For the defendant it was said that there was a *bona fide* dispute as to the existence of a partnership, and the court would not, under these circumstances, appoint a receiver. Reference was made to *Tucker v. Prior* (ante, p. 784), where the law was carefully gone into, and Charles, J., refused to appoint a receiver; also to *Lindley on Partnership*, 4th ed., vol. 2, p. 1012; *Peacock v. Peacock* (16 Ves. 49), *Chapman v. Beach* (1 Jac. & W. 594), *Fairburn v. Pearson* (3 M. & G. 144). The affidavit on which the interim injunction was granted was misleading and the injunction should be dissolved: *Custelli v. Oost* (7 Hare, 94). If a receiver was appointed it should be the defendant, who had managed the business.

CHARLES, J., said that this was one of those exceptional cases where, though the partnership was in dispute, in his opinion a receiver should be appointed. It had been proved that the book debts were in danger, and he did not see that the receiver would injure the plaintiff. He should refuse to appoint the defendant as receiver, but continued the interim injunction, referring it to chambers to appoint a receiver.—COUNSEL, George Henderson; Decimus Sturges. SOLICITORS, Bell, Brodribb, & Gray, for Walker & Tosedale, Leeds; Hamlin, Grammer, & Hamlin, for B. C. Pullen, Leeds.

ATTACHMENT—ANCIENT LIGHTS—OBSTRUCTION—INJUNCTION—CONTEMPT—AFFIDAVIT—CROSS-EXAMINATION—R. S. C., 1883, XXXVII., 20.

In the case of *Plake v. Hall*, before Charles, J., on the 14th inst., the question arose whether counsel on behalf of the defendant had a right in the vacation to cross-examine the plaintiff on a motion for leave to issue a writ of attachment against the plaintiff. The action was brought by Hermann Plake, cane blind manufacturer, against the defendant to restrain him from erecting or permitting to remain on the Whitfield Burial Ground, Tottenham-court-road, a booth or tent so as to darken, injure, or obstruct the ancient lights of the plaintiff. On the 9th of September last Kekewich, J., made an order restraining the defendant in the terms of the notice of motion. This order was not obeyed, as the plaintiff alleged, and a motion was now brought for leave to issue a writ of attachment against the defendant. The plaintiff said that the original tent had been removed, but another was put there which darkened the plaintiff's windows. The defendant's counsel then claimed as his right to cross-examine the plaintiff on his affidavit, under rule 20 of order 37, and was allowed to do so by the judge. The plaintiff in his cross-examination admitted that the old tent had been removed, but was unshaken in his evidence that a tent was darkening his rooms.

CHARLES, J., said that he was satisfied that an impudent contempt of court had been committed, and made an order that the writ should issue, the order not to be drawn up for two days, the defendant to pay the costs.

Subsequently Charles, J., gave leave to the defendant's counsel to move in chambers the following day on giving notice to the other side.

On the 15th inst. Charles, J., on the defendant satisfying the court that he had removed the tent, and had paid the costs, discharged the order, and on the defendant submitting to a perpetual injunction, the action came to an end.—COUNSEL, Eustace Smith; C. H. Turner. SOLICITORS, S. B. Abrahams; W. W. King.

COMPANY—DIRECTORS—REMOVAL—NOTICE

In the case of *Browne v. La Trinidad (Limited) and Others* before Charles, J., on the 19th inst., the question arose as to the sufficiency of notice to a director of a meeting at which it was decided to remove him from being a director. This was a motion on behalf of James Thomas Browne, a director of the company, to restrain the company and the directors from holding a meeting on the 12th of October, 1887, and from hindering the plaintiff from acting as director, and attending the meetings of the company. A meeting had been held of the board of directors at which it was resolved to convene an extraordinary general meeting of the company to pass certain resolutions. The first resolution was to remove the plaintiff from the directorate. The meeting of the board of directors was held at 3.30 in the City, and notice of the meeting was given to the plaintiff at 3.28. Article 91 of the Articles of Association gave the company power to remove a director, but article 6 provided that Browne should remain a director until 1888. The first meeting had been held and the first resolution had been passed, but the second meeting, to confirm the resolutions, was fixed for the 28th of October. On behalf of the plaintiff reference was made to *Fulbrook v. Richmond Consolidated Mining Co.* (9 Ch. D. 610); *Imperial Hydropathic Hotel Co., Blackpool v. Hampson* (23 Ch. D. 1); *Harben v. Phillips* (23 Ch. D. 14). The company had no power to remove Browne before 1888, and the second meeting should be restrained. For the defendants it was contended that the motion was practically to enforce specific performance of an agreement to employ the plaintiff. The court was asked to compel the company against their will to take the plaintiff back when he was engaged in litigation against them. The court would not do this. Reference was made to *Walker v. The London Tramways Co.* (12 Ch. D. 705). Notice to a director was not really necessary; if Browne had had notice, the resolution would have been passed all the same, so he was not damaged.

CHARLES, J., said that there was an initial infirmity in these proceedings, the plaintiff, Mr. Browne, had had no notice whatever of a meeting at which the directors came to the conclusion that an extraordinary general meeting of the company should be summoned to remove the plaintiff from being a director. Giving no opinion as to the rights of the plaintiff under the articles, he granted an injunction to restrain the defendants from holding a meeting to confirm the first resolution, and to restrain the defendants from hindering the plaintiff from acting as a director.—

COUNSEL, *Morton, Q.C., and D. L. Alexander; Latham, Q.C., and P. F. Stokes.* SOLICITORS, *W. F. Turn; Parker, Barrett, & Parker.*

ATTACHMENT—ORDER—DISOBEDIENCE—TAXATION—SUMMONS TO VARY TAXING MASTER'S CERTIFICATE.

In the case of *Re Fassett, Wells v. Dearle*, before Charles, J., on the 19th inst., the question arose as to the issue of a writ of attachment against a solicitor, pending the hearing of a summons taken out by him to vary the taxing master's certificate. This was a motion for leave to issue a writ of attachment against the defendant Dearle, a solicitor, for disobedience to an order made on the 6th of May, 1887, whereby the defendant was ordered to pay £908 18s. 2d. into court. This sum consisted of £185 19s. 9d. balance found due from the defendant to the estate of Fassett, after deducting £216 2s. 7d. costs. About £100 of these costs had been disallowed, and the defendant had taken out a summons to vary the certificate of the taxing master. For the plaintiff it was said that after fourteen days the taxing master's certificate was conclusive, and he was entitled to his order. For the defendant it was said that, pending the summons, the order ought not to be made. Reference was made to R. S. C., 1883, LXV., 39, and *Middleton v. Chichester*, 19 W. R. 299, 6 Ch. 152. At all events, the defendant ought to have liberty to apply to Stirling, J., to reduce the amount. One judge could not alter another's order.

CHARLES, J., ordered the writ to issue, to lie in the office for a fortnight, the defendant to pay the costs.—COUNSEL, *A. Biddall; A. Beckett Terrell.* SOLICITORS, *B. Burton; J. G. Dearle.*

MANCHESTER COUNTY COURT.

Re WALTER LOWE—12th October.

ALLEGATIONS OF CAUSES OF FAILURE IN DEBTOR'S STATEMENT.

During the public examination of this debtor, before Mr. Registrar Lister, Mr. Newman, who appeared for creditors, referred to a statement appended to the official summary of the debtor's affairs, in which the debtor alleged, amongst other things, "that the cause of his failure was due to unwarrantable pressure from Woolley and several other creditors withdrawing their credit from him." To this allegation Mr. Newman objected, and in examination the debtor said he informed the official receiver, or some members of his staff, that one of the causes of his failure was the pressure already described, but that, to the best of his knowledge, the official receiver had not made any inquiries into the truth of his allegation. Mr. Newman contended that it was a libellous statement, and was calculated to injure the excellent reputation which Messrs. Woolley possessed. He thought that inquiries ought to be instituted before the official receiver published, on debtors' statements, allegations of that kind, because Mr. Dibb occupied an official position, and the public were too apt to think that such statements were correct. The official receiver said he acted under the directions of the Board of Trade, and Mr. Newman could test the point by bringing an action. The registrar said he could not say that the official receiver was wrong, but he should be glad if the point was properly tested. The official receiver said he should be glad to get rid of the annoyance, and he wished Mr. Newman would write to the Board of Trade on the subject. Mr. Newman said he would do so, and suggested that in the meantime the official receiver should put at the end of such statements that they were made without any inquiry having been instituted as to their genuineness. He contended that there was not the slightest justification for putting Messrs. Woolley's name in the statement. The registrar pointed out that the causes of the debtor's failure were only "alleged." Mr. Newman: Suppose the debtor said that his failure was due to the official receiver's mismanagement of some property. Would he insert that? The official receiver: Certainly. May I say that I adopted that form in consequence of some observations which a judge made? The question was whether my phraseology was what the debtor actually said, and the judge advised me to quote from what they said in future. The registrar thought it very desirable that the point should be inquired into. Mr. Newman remarked that Mr. Dibb's name being attached to the debtor's statement gave it an official tendency. The registrar agreed that the name being appended to the statement gave it a degree of importance. The official receiver said the object of the Bankruptcy Act was not only to find out what the debtor had done, but also whether some of the creditors were not open to criticism. The registrar said it was doubtless a hardship when creditors should not only lose their money, but be bandied before the public. There were many men who would rather lose their money than have their names given in that way. That was a weak point of the Bankruptcy Act, but he did not know how they could get over it. The official receiver said he had no desire to say that which would harm anyone. Mr. Newman said the debtor had admitted that no questions were asked by anyone in the official receiver's office whether his statement was justifiable. He contended that it was a libellous statement, and he did not see how the official receiver was privileged. The registrar: If you feel this is a public question, I do not think you ought to sit down with what the Board of Trade say. The official receiver: By the Bankruptcy Act the Board of Trade have power to put forward the forms, and they prescribe this very form. The registrar thought there was no doubt it was rather hard upon creditors. He did not know whether the examinations of debtor sought always to be public, but to open that question would be to go to the root of the whole Bill. Parliament had said they ought to be so, but he had great misgivings about it, and he thought some discretion ought to be allowed to the court as to how far matters should be made public. Some people whose names were brought before the court felt the circumstances acutely, and he had had many complaints, but it was not his fault, or the fault of the official receiver,

or the Board of Trade. So long, however, as the tendency of Parliament was in the direction of making these matters public they ought to assist the press, and if public opinion was against the system let it be expressed so as to bring pressure to bear on the proper authorities. The official receiver said he always tried to act impartially, and do that which he believed was the intention of the Legislature. The registrar said he did not think anyone could say a word against that view. The official receiver said he would be glad if Mr. Newman would have the point properly tested. Mr. Newman promised to write to the Board of Trade on the subject.

CORONERS' INQUISITIONS.

MR. HERBERT STEPHEN has addressed a letter under this heading to the *Times*, in which he says:—There seems to be a good deal of misunderstanding current as to the effect of the verdict of murder returned by the coroner's jury at Michelstown against those of the police whom Mr. Harrington did not compliment. This inquisition, unless it is quashed, or the Irish Attorney-General enters a *nolle prosequi*, will have to be tried before a jury as if it were an indictment, and that whether the grand jury find a true bill or ignore a bill, or do not have any bill sent up to them. It often happens in England that persons are committed by coroners to be tried for manslaughter where the magistrates have refused to commit them, or where they have not been charged before magistrates. In such cases a course sometimes taken is that the judge directs that a bill should be submitted to the grand jury. If the grand jury find a true bill they present the bill submitted to them, which is thereafter properly described as an indictment, and then the accused may be tried indifferently on the presentment of the grand jury or on the coroner's inquisition. If the grand jury find no true bill it is usual for counsel for the prosecution—i.e., for the Crown—to ask the leave of the judge to offer no evidence on the trial of the inquisition. The prisoner is then arraigned, the jury are sworn, and, no evidence being offered, the judge directs a verdict of not guilty, usually explaining to the petit jury that he allows this course to be taken in consequence of the decision of the grand jury that there is not enough evidence to justify them in putting the prisoner on his trial. Sometimes the judge does not trouble the grand jury in the matter at all, but merely advises that no evidence should be given on the inquisition, but in every case the accused has to be formally tried and a verdict given on the inquisition. In the present instance a bill may be sent before the grand jury and ignored, but the accused will still have to be tried, and a petit jury will have to return a verdict. If it is the opinion of the Executive in Dublin that presumably innocent men ought not to be tried for their lives by a jury upon no stronger grounds than the proceedings which have made Mr. Coroner Rice and Mr. Harrington, M.P., notorious, the right course for them to pursue is to move to have the inquisition quashed. This is, happily, not a sort of application for which our legal history furnishes many precedents. But it seems to be clear that the High Court has power to quash an inquisition and issue a writ *ad melius inquirendum* on the ground that the coroner misbehaved himself. It is laid down in *Corner's Crown Practice* (p. 203), quoting from *Hawkins's Pleas of the Crown* (vol. 2, c. 9, s. 54), that "if it appear that a coroner hath been guilty of any corrupt practice in the taking of an inquisition, it seems that a *melius inquirendum* shall be awarded for the taking of a new one by special commissioners, who shall not proceed on the view of the body, but on the testimony of witnesses; and the coroner shall have nothing to do in the taking of such new inquest, because it appears from his former misbehaviour that he is not to be trusted. But where his inquisition is quashed for a defect in a point of form only, he may, and ought, to take a new one, in like manner as if he had not taken any before." Among the authorities which *Hawkins* gives for this proposition are *Barclay's case*, mentioned by Hale (*Pleas of the Crown*, I., 415, and II., 60), and the case of *R. v. Hetherell*, reported in 3 Mod. 80, and decided about 1685. In *Barclay's case* the subject of the inquest had drowned himself, and the coroner was said to have refused to hear evidence that he was insane, in consequence of which the verdict was *felix de se* (which involved forfeiture of his goods to the Crown). The inquisition was quashed, and a *melius inquirendum* granted. In *R. v. Hetherell* the complaint was that the man had been found insane when he was really *felix de se*. The application was refused, but the court told the counsel who made it that "if he could produce an affidavit that the jury did not go according to their evidence, or of indirect proceedings of the coroner, then they would grant it." The other cases on the subject that I have been able to collate all turn on the point of suicide or insanity, but these appear to make it clear that misconduct or partiality by a coroner is a ground of application for a *melius inquirendum* which the court will entertain.

The vacancy caused in the office of taxing master of the Irish Supreme Court by the sudden death of Mr. Archibald Robinson has caused universal regret. Mr. Robinson was, says the Dublin correspondent of the *Times*, for many years a solicitor in extensive and lucrative business, and last year was appointed one of the taxing masters in the Supreme Court. The following high tribute to his character, which was paid by the Lord Chancellor and published at his lordship's request, expresses feelings which are generally shared:—"I knew him intimately for many years. He was one of my truest and most valued friends. I entertained for him the most sincere esteem and respect. The public have lost a most able, upright, and painstaking official, one who did his work with all his heart, loyalty and well. I am truly and sincerely sorry, very sorry, for his death."

LAW SOCIETIES.

HUDDERSFIELD INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of this society was held on Monday evening, Mr. S. LEAROLD (president) in the chair.

After the report and balance-sheet had been adopted, the retiring president (Mr. Learold) delivered an address on commercial education, and the relation of legal training to it. In the course of it Mr. Learold pointed out the interest of the question to solicitors, and the importance of it to the community, and said that anything that they could do to promote their local industry must benefit the district and promote the interests of the legal profession. It was a misfortune that their commercial life was regarded more as a trade or occupation than a science, and the question of profit had been the consideration more than the study of the principles on which commercial prosperity depended. After referring at some length to the weakness of our commercial training, and to the fact that the strength of our foreign competitors rested upon their superior commercial education, the president referred to the various systems of commercial and technical education abroad, and pointed out the comprehensive nature of the studies of the pupils. It was, he said, almost a chronic habit in Huddersfield to send deputations to other towns to see what they were doing, but why should not Huddersfield in this matter take the lead and show it to be possible to tack on to a system of technical education one of commercial education, and form classes for teaching it? It was obvious that a knowledge of commercial law was at the very foundation of a commercial education, and without it such a course would be useless and impossible. As to who was to teach the law in these commercial schools he was prepared to throw out a challenge to our commercial and technical tribunals—namely, That if they could provide the classes, the society he represented would, so far as the legal part was concerned, find the teachers from among the professional men of Huddersfield who were thoroughly capable of undertaking the duty. What had the profession done for the good of the town? Practically nothing, as a society and a profession. Here, as it seemed to him, was their opportunity, and if commercial classes were formed in connection with the Chamber of Commerce and Technical School, let the society be prepared to undertake the legal part of the training; and then let the town set an example to other centres of industry, and show that they were in earnest in removing from their commercial life the stigma which existed upon it. After pointing out the lamentable ignorance there was among commercial men of commercial law, Mr. Learold said that, so far as he knew, England was about the only civilized country in which that education was not afforded. Surely it was time for them to realize their deficiencies, and to set to work to remedy them. In conclusion he moved:—"That the Huddersfield Incorporated Law Society begs to call the attention of the Chamber of Commerce and the Technical School of Huddersfield to the question of commercial education, and begs to offer that in the event of an attempt being made to impart this education this society will be glad to afford the necessary professors and teachers to undertake the legal part of the training."

Mr. HENRY BARKER, in seconding the resolution, said that all that it committed them to was that if the authorities of the town would undertake to supply this general necessity in the matter of a commercial education, the society would see that the scheme did not come to grief for want of instruction in the legal element.

After a few words from Mr. Sykes, the resolution was passed.

Mr. C. MILLS moved:—"That in the opinion of this society a large extension of the county court system is desirable. He found that some sixteen years ago he seconded at the annual meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce a resolution in favour of extending the jurisdiction of the county courts. He pointed out that the system had been extended in various directions, and he was perfectly satisfied that with another extension, subject to the limits as to value or as to removal into the superior courts under certain conditions, the commercial community would greatly benefit. Although the subject had been discussed seventeen or eighteen years throughout the country he never heard of a single objection to the extension of the system, and, indeed, the Judicature Commission which sat in 1870 or 1871 recommended it, but the recommendation had not been adopted."

Mr. J. H. DRANSFIELD seconded the resolution.

Judge SNAGG, who supported the resolution, said he had listened with great interest to the able, instructive, and suggestive address of Mr. Learold, but he confessed he listened with some slight feeling of alarm to the suggestion that commercial men should be instructed in the principles of commercial law. It was in accordance with the spirit of the age and the modern tendency towards improved methods of illumination, but he trembled to think what would be the consequences for the judges, and he shuddered when he thought of the intensity that would be given to the fierce light of criticism that beat upon the judicial bench. At present, when he sat in court, he had before him critics—able and learned, but friendly—but what could it be when, in addition, he had row after row of hard-headed, long-headed commercial men fresh from the lectures of his friend, Mr. Learold—half of them disappointed suitors, all of them more or less *inimici curiæ*; all of them fresh from the footnotes of the last edition of Addison on Contracts, Byles upon Bills, or Benjamin on Sales. However, the judges must suffer for the public welfare—and he entirely agreed that the proposal to instruct commercial men engaged in large and important commercial transactions, in the principles of commercial law, was a valuable suggestion, and under proper regulations was one which was well worthy of being tried at least as an experiment. Referring to the resolution immediately before the meeting, he said he had some

hesitation and a feeling of delicacy in dealing with it, because of his position as judge, but it would be the greatest dissimulation on his part if he were to conceal the fact that he took a deep interest in the subject of the resolution. He could not conceal from himself that somehow or other, not only upon this question, but on many others, the principle of decentralization was in the air, and that this question of the extension of the common law jurisdiction of the county courts which had been so long ripening was perhaps nearly ripe, and some day—perhaps no very distant day—it might fall to his lot to have to administer an extended common law jurisdiction. After describing the existing anomalies in county court jurisdiction, he referred to the fact that in 1879 Lord Cairns introduced into the House of Lords a Bill dealing with this very subject, and quoted the following extract from the speech the noble lord then made: "In the whole of this question, without any exception, there was a general recommendation in favour of the extension of the jurisdiction. The extension which I propose is this: To increase the jurisdiction of the county courts from the sum of £50, at which it now stands, to the sum of £200, and I propose further that the plaintiffs shall have the power of commencing actions in the county court for a still higher amount, but in that case there would be the absolute right on the part of the defendant if he does not wish to have the case disposed of by the county court to remove the case into the higher court." That Bill, however, fell in the massacre of the innocents in 1879. After 1879 came the General Election of 1880, and after that came—what should he call it?—the Parliamentary deluge. He supposed that Lord Cairns' Bill would have to be revived if anything was to be done. He found that down to 1876 the average number of claims above £50 entered into the county courts, by consent of the parties, was about 30; from 1876 to 1883 the number jumped up to between 300 and 400 on the average; and during the last four years it had been nearer 700 than 600, which to his mind indicated that the public were in favour of an extension of the system. In addition to all these there were 300 or 400 cases under the Employers' Liability Act, and 800 or 900 cases remitted from the High Court, so that they had already in the county courts an enormous amount of work of the highest class. The question was, Did the public want the extension?—he thought they did; and the next question was, Could they have it? It was entirely a question for the Legislature, and perhaps some day the Legislature might take it up.

After a few words from Mr. SYKES, who thought there ought to be no limit to the jurisdiction of the courts in the matter of amount, and a short address by the CHAIRMAN, the resolution was passed.

Mr. ALFRED SYKES then, in very appropriate terms, presented to Mr. T. S. SIMPSON the gold medal, and Mr. SIMPSON replied.

On the motion of Mr. JAS. YEMAN, seconded by Mr. J. H. SYKES, the retiring officers were thanked for their services, and the vote was acknowledged by Mr. W. RAMSDEN.

On the motion of Mr. ARMITAGE, seconded by Mr. J. J. BOOTH, Mr. Learold was re-elected president, and he acknowledged the compliment.

On the motion of Mr. JOHN HAIGH, seconded by Mr. WELSH, the other officers were elected; and on the motion of the PRESIDENT, seconded by Mr. HALL, Mr. W. Armitage was elected deputy-chairman of committee.

Mr. ARMITAGE moved, and Mr. BARKER seconded, that the subscription for the next year should be two guineas, and the resolution was passed.

On the motion of Mr. J. H. DRANSFIELD, seconded by Mr. A. H. J. FLETCHER, Mr. Alfred Sykes was cordially thanked for having conducted the classes for instruction in the elements of woollen and worsted manufacture, and in reply Mr. SYKES said he should be glad to renew the classes next year.

The thanks of the meeting were, on the motion of the PRESIDENT, seconded by Mr. HAIGH, accorded to the Mayor and Town Clerk for the provision made for the meeting.

The proceedings shortly afterwards terminated.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.—Oct. 4.—Chairman—Mr. Ernest Todd.—The subject for debate was, "That this society disapproves of the proclamation of the National League." Mr. T. H. Richmond opened the debate, and was followed by Messrs. Crawford, Fergus, Napier, Riddell, and Savory. The motion was lost by a majority of six.

Oct. 11.—Chairman—Mr. T. Douglas.—The subject for debate was, "That a Court of Appeal in Criminal Cases is desirable." Mr. Wilmot E. Elmalie opened the debate, and was followed by Messrs. E. Todd, C. F. Ellis, P. T. Rhys, R. D. Muir, J. D. Crawford, J. J. Dodd, and W. G. Hawtin. The motion was lost.

Oct. 18.—Chairman—Mr. J. C. Wheeler.—The subject for debate was, "That the Parliamentary Franchise should be extended to Women." Mr. W. A. Blaney opened the debate, and was followed by Messrs. G. H. Bower, P. T. Rhys, W. L. Gane, J. D. Crawford, James Gray, W. M. Woodhouse, A. Norman, F. E. Goodheart, and T. Douglas. The motion was lost.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.—Oct. 17.—The annual general meeting was held, Mr. Bateman Napier in the chair. After the usual routine business had been disposed of, including the proposing and seconding of fourteen new members, the reports of the retiring officers were presented, and considerable discussion took place thereon, after which the meeting elected the officers for the ensuing year, as follows:—Mr. A. K. Common, chairman; Mr. J. R. Yates, secretary; Mr. C. A. Elgood, treasurer; Mr. C. W. Bawlinson, reporter; and Mr. Lazarus, secretary of legal correspondence department; Mr. E. W. Pearson, vice-chairman; Mr. H. W. Marcus, editor; Mr. S. F. Goodall, secretary of societies union; and in

Mr. F. G. Wood, auditor. Upon the motion of Mr. Richardson, seconded by Mr. Moyle, the discussion of the question of continuing the existing arrangements with reference to the Magazine was adjourned to the first meeting in November.

LEGAL NEWS.

OBITUARY.

Mr. DUNCAN STEWART, barrister, died at Harthill Hall, Derbyshire, on the 12th ult. Mr. Stewart was the second son of Mr. Duncan Stewart, Solicitor-General of Barbadoes, and was born in 1825. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Easter Term, 1862, and he formerly practised in the Court of Chancery. He was for several years secretary to the Chief Registrar in Bankruptcy, and he was Assistant-Receiver of Insolvent Estates from 1870 till 1872, when he was appointed Receiver of Insolvent Estates. He was appointed Taxing Master in Bankruptcy in 1877, and on the passing of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, he became a master of the High Court of Justice in Bankruptcy. Mr. Stewart was married in 1863 to the daughter of the Rev. Charles Mackenzie.

Mr. ARTHUR PAWSON, barrister, died suddenly in his chambers, 2, Pump-court, Temple, on the 5th inst. His landlady, on entering his bedroom, found him lying dead. Mr. Pawson was the third son of Mr. John Falshaw Pawson, of Mill-hill, and was born in 1847. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Easter Term, 1869, and he had practised on the North-Eastern Circuit, and at the West Riding and Leeds Sessions.

Mr. THOMAS JOHNSON, solicitor, of Midhurst, died on the 29th ult. at the age of seventy-six. Mr. Johnson was born in 1811. He was admitted a solicitor in 1837, and he had for many years conducted an extensive practice at Midhurst. He had been clerk to the county magistrates at that place ever since 1839, and he was also registrar of the Midhurst County Court (Circuit No. 50) and a perpetual commissioner for the county of Sussex. He had been for several years associated in partnership with his son, Mr. William Thomas Johnson, who was admitted a solicitor in 1875. Mr. Johnson was buried at Stedham on the 3rd inst.

Mr. ISAAC WEIR, Q.C., died very suddenly at Enniskillen on the 10th inst. Mr. Weir was engaged in early life as a newspaper reporter, in which capacity he was for many years connected with the *D Belfast News Letter*. He adopted the legal profession under the advice of the late Lord Cairns, and he was called to the bar in Ireland in 1864. He was a member of the North-East Circuit. He soon obtained a fair practice, and he was a prosecuting Crown counsel for the county of Armagh. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1885. He was the leading counsel for the defendant in the important libel action of *Bolton v O'Brien*. Mr. Weir was, at the time of his death, engaged in his duties as revising barrister for the county of Fermanagh.

Mr. ANTHONY GILBERT JONES, solicitor, of Gloucester, died at Hatherley Court, Gloucestershire, on the 4th inst., in his seventy-eighth year. Mr. Jones was born in 1810. He was admitted a solicitor about the year 1833, and for many years he carried on an extensive practice at Gloucester. He was for a long time the principal Liberal agent for the city. He had been for many years connected with the corporation of Gloucester. He was an alderman at the time of his death, and he had been three times mayor of the city. Mr. Jones retired from practice about three years ago, and he was soon afterwards appointed a magistrate for Gloucestershire, having been previously for many years a magistrate for the city of Gloucester. Mr. Jones leaves three sons and two daughters. His son, Mr. Francis William Jones, is clerk of the peace for Gloucester, and his son, Mr. John Henry Jones, is under-sheriff of Gloucestershire.

Mr. CHARLES JOHN ALLEN, solicitor, of Bedford-row, died on the 15th inst. Mr. Allen was the son of Mr. Joshua John Allen, solicitor. He was admitted a solicitor in 1854, having been articled to his father, when he joined the firm of Norris, Allen, & Carter; but since his father's death he had been the only surviving partner. Mr. Allen had an extensive practice. He was a commissioner to administer oaths in the Chancery Court of Lancaster. He had a large Welsh agency business, and he was acting under-sheriff for the town of Carmarthen. He was also Steward of the Manor of Great Hormead, in Hertfordshire. Mr. Allen was the cousin of Mr. Henry George Allen, Q.C., and his brother, the late Mr. Joshua Bird Allen, was for several years a chief clerk in the Court of Chancery.

Mr. GEORGE MAW, solicitor, of Bishop Auckland, died on the 13th inst. from the effects of an accident on the previous day. He had been thrown from his horse through a collision with a wagon. Mr. Maw was born in 1850. He was educated at Durham Grammar School, and he was admitted a solicitor in 1872, having served his articles with Mr. Robert Fisher Thompson, of Kendal. He was clerk to the Spennymoor Local Board, and he had a good private practice, being especially successful in county court advocacy. Mr. Maw was buried at Southchurch on the 15th inst.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY GOODWIN, solicitor (of the firm of Young & Goodwin), of Hastings, died suddenly on the 5th inst. Mr. Goodwin was a native of Shrewsbury, where he was born in 1826. He was admitted a solicitor in 1865, and in the following year he settled at Hastings, where he had a large practice, being associated in partnership with Mr. William Blackman Young, the registrar of the Hastings County Court. Mr. Goodwin was buried at Hastings Borough Cemetery on the 10th inst., the funeral being attended by many professional and other friends. His son, Mr. Frederick Goodwin, LL.D., was admitted a solicitor in 1883.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. WILLIAM JOHN MANN, solicitor, of Trowbridge, has been appointed Assistant Clerk to the Melksham Board of Guardians. Mr. Mann was admitted a solicitor in 1870.

Mr. DAVID EDWARD JONES, solicitor (of the firm of Tennant & Jones), of Aberavon, Neath, and Britonferry, has been appointed Clerk to the Margam Local Board, in succession to the late Mr. Martin Soan. Mr. Jones was admitted a solicitor in 1876. He is in partnership with Mr. Marmaduke Tennant, town clerk of Aberavon.

Mr. JOHN SATTERFIELD SANDARS, barrister, has been appointed Secretary to the Committee appointed by the Home Secretary to inquire into the accommodation provided for prisoners at petty sessions and police courts. Mr. Sandars is the only son of Mr. Charles Sandars, of Mackworth, Derbyshire, and was born in 1853. He was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, where he graduated 3rd class in Jurisprudence in 1875, and he subsequently proceeded to the degree of B.C.L. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in January, 1877, and he is a member of the Midland Circuit. Mr. Sandars is at present Assistant private secretary to Mr. Matthews.

Mr. HENRY REILLY, solicitor, of Dublin, has been appointed a Taxing Master of the Chancery Division in Ireland, in succession to Mr. Archibald Robinson, deceased. Mr. Reilly was admitted a solicitor at Dublin in 1864. He has filled the office of President of the Irish Incorporated Law Society.

Mr. GEORGE WOODYATT HASTINGS, barrister, M.P., has been elected Chairman of the Worcestershire Quarter Sessions, on the resignation of the Earl of Coventry. Mr. Hastings is the only son of Sir Charles Hastings, M.D., and was born in 1825. He was educated at Bromsgrove School and at Christ's College, Cambridge, where he graduated in the 1st class of the Civil Law Tripos in 1850. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Easter Term, 1850, and he formerly practised on the Oxford Circuit. He has been M.P. for East Worcestershire in the Liberal interest since 1880, and he has been for several years deputy-chairman of Quarter Sessions for that county. He is a deputy-lieutenant for Herefordshire and a magistrate for Herefordshire and Worcestershire.

Mr. BRADSHAW CAMPBELL, solicitor, of Warwick, has been appointed Town Clerk of that borough in succession to Mr. George Cattell Greenway, resigned. Mr. Campbell was admitted a solicitor in 1868. He is registrar of the Warwick County Court, and clerk to the county magistrates.

Mr. FOSTER JOHN BONE, solicitor, of Devonport, has been appointed Clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes for the South Devon Division of Devonshire, in succession to his brother, the late Mr. Allan Belfield Bone. Mr. F. J. Bone was admitted a solicitor in 1865. He is clerk to the magistrates for the borough of Devonport.

PARTNERSHIPS DISSOLVED.

RICHARD SUTTON CLIFFORD and WILLIAM LIVESY, solicitors (Clifford & Livesey), Derby. Sept. 30. The said William Livesey will in future carry on the said practice alone. [Gazette, Oct. 14.]

FRANCIS ALFRED CORBOLD, LUCAS TEMPLE CORBOLD, and EDWARD BROUGHTON ROUSE, solicitors (Corbold, Sons, & Rouse), Ipswich. Oct. 8. HENRY MONTAGUE TRENCHARD and HARRY CARTWRIGHT HART, solicitors (Trenchard & Hart), No. 35, Bucklesbury, London. Sept. 29. [Gazette, Oct. 12.]

GENERAL.

The Prince of Wales has joined the council of the Selden Society.

A special session of the Central Criminal Court will be held at the Sessions-house, Old Bailey, on Monday next, when the judges will attend for the purpose of fixing the days of the sittings for the ensuing legal year. The ordinary sessions of the court will commence on the same day.

The following is the rota of attendance of the masters of the Queen's Bench Division in chambers during the ensuing Michaelmas Sittings—viz., A to F, Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, Master Johnson; Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, Master Gordon. G to N, Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, Master Kaye; Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, Master George Pollock. O to Z, Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, Master Walton; Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, Master Manley Smith.

At the meeting of the Court of Aldermen on Tuesday a letter was read from Mr. J. H. Gresham, Chief Clerk at the Justice Room of the Mansion House, asking permission to retire from his office, in consequence of his precarious state of health. On the motion of Sir Andrew Lusk it was resolved that the letter should be referred to the General Purposes Committee to consider and report, and that they should also inquire into the nature, duties, and emoluments of the office.

The Report of the Commissioners of Prisons, just issued, says that if the prison population had increased since 1878 in proportion with the general population, it would be 8,432 more than it actually is. It is remarkable that the decrease in the female prison population has been much larger in proportion than that of the males. In 1876-77 there were on an average 16,184 males and 4,227 females. In 1886-87 the number of males was 12,244, or 24.1 per cent. less, and of the females 2,732, or 35.6 per cent. less. The cost of maintaining the prisons has decreased during the past year from £343,697 to £332,128.

Last week, at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, Mr. Michael Walton (of the firm of Messrs. Walton & Lee) submitted to auction the Heasley Estate, Northumberland. The auctioneer observed that it was one of the finest properties ever submitted, and he expressed his belief that it was the largest English estate ever offered to public auction at the Mart; certainly it was the largest within the last twenty years. The estate extended

over 20,000 acres, and was divided into nineteen well-arranged farms, all of which were let to substantial tenants at reduced rents—in some cases to the extent of 50 per cent.—to meet the exigencies of the times. The whole estate produced an annual rental of over £5,000. The first bid was £80,000, followed by others for £85,000, £90,000, £95,000, £96,000, £97,000, £98,000, and £100,000. The two next offers were £102,500 and £105,000, followed by others of £106,000, £107,000, and £110,000. The biddings then increased by £1,000 each to £119,000, at which the property was withdrawn, the auctioneer pointing out that to pay four per cent. it was worth £125,000.

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	APPEAL COURT No. 1.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice KAY.	Mr. Justice CHITTY.
Mon., Oct. 24	Mr. Ward	Mr. Clowes	Mr. Carrington	Mr. Jackson
Tuesday 25	King	Pemberton	Lavie	Koe
Wednesday 26	Pemberton	Clowes	Carrington	Jackson
Thursday 27	Clowes	Pemberton	Lavie	Koe
Friday 28	Koe	Clowes	Carrington	Jackson
Saturday 29	Jackson	Pemberton	Lavie	Koe

	Mr. Justice NORTH.	Mr. Justice STIRLING.	Mr. Justice KNEEWICH.
Monday, August 24	Mr. Leach	Mr. King	Mr. Beal
Tuesday 25	Godfrey	Ward	Pugh
Wednesday 26	Leach	King	Beal
Thursday 27	Godfrey	Ward	Pugh
Friday 28	Leach	King	Beal
Saturday 29	Godfrey	Ward	Pugh

COURT OF APPEAL.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1887.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—Queen's Bench Final Appeals in Court I., and Chancery Appeals (General List) in Court II., will be taken on the usual days during Michaelmas Sittings.

Queen's Bench Interlocutory Appeals in Court I., and Chancery Interlocutory Appeals in Court II., will be taken on the first day of the Sittings, also in Court I., on the second day (Tuesday), and afterwards as usual, every Wednesday, during the Sittings. Bankruptcy Appeals also, as usual, on Friday in Court I.

Appeals from the Lancaster Palatine Court (if any), which have been passed over in the General List, will be taken in Court II. on Thursday, October 27, and Thursday, November 3, and Thursday, December 1.

The Admiralty Appeals (with Assessors) will be taken in Court I. on days to be specially appointed by the court.

APPEALS FOR HEARING.

(Set down to Saturday, October 15, inclusive.)

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

For Hearing.

(General List.)

Lord Camoys v Mayor, &c. of Barham appl of plit from judgt of V C Bacon (part heard Feb 2, 1886, by Master of Rolls. Lords Justices Lindley & Lopes—s o for engineer in report—report filed—s o till appls made to restore).
Societe Generale de Paris v Dreyfus Bros & Co app of defts: Dreyfus Bros & Co, from order of Mr. Justice Pearson, dated 26 March 1885 April 1, 1885 (S O, Nov 1)

1887.

Bird v Andrew app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice Kay, dated 7 March, 1887 April 7

In re Fitzgerald's Settled Estates Fitzgerald v White app of plit from order of Mr Justice North, dated 21 March, 1887 April 13

Peck, Bart v Derry app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice Stirling, dated 24 March, 1887 April 20

In re The Mount Morgan (West) Gold Mine Id & Co's Act, 1882 Expts Stephen H West app of the Co from order of Mr Justice Kay, dated 5 April, 1887 directing removal from register April 21

Tennant v The Swansea Harbour Trustees app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated 24 February, 1887 April 22 (Not before Nov 2)

In re W. Sherwood, dec Metcalf v Sherwood app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice North, dated 25 May, 1887 April 25

In re Wm Henderson, dec Newson v Freeman app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice North, dated 21 April, 1887 May 2

The Metropolitan District Ry Co v The Metropolitan District Joint Committee & Metropolitan Ry Co app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated 3 May, 1887 May 4

The Metropolitan District Ry Co v The Metropolitan Ry Co app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice North, dated 16 July, 1886 May 6

Moseley v Victoria Rubber Co app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Chitty, dated 26 April, 1887 May 9

In re E. Westall, dec West v Westall app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Stirling, dated 29 April, 1887, on originating summons May 17

Hall v Ewin app of dft John Ewin from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated 3 May, 1887 May 19

Tucker v Bennett app of dft William Bennett from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated 23 Jan, 1887 May 21

In re Brunel's Island Co, Id, & Co's Act app of Rt Hon G A F Bantline, M.P., from order of Mr Justice Kay, dated 6 April, disallowing items in his claim as creditor May 22

In re Brunel's Island Co Id & Co's Act app of Rt Hon G A F Bantline, M.P., and Sir H. Drummond Wolff from order of Mr Justice Kay, dated 19 April, varying Chief Clerk's certificate of contributories May 23

In re T J Mills, dec Grant v Hayat an (construction) app of plit and dft from judgt of Mr Justice Stirling dated 29 April, 1887 May 25

Evans v Benyon app of dft Richard Benyon from judgt of Mr Justice Kay dated May 5, 1887 June 1
In re Holly Mount Estate and Co's Act pet of J F Dale and anr app of petitors from Mr Justice Kay refusing winding up order dated 31 May, 1887 June 2

To be continued.

From Orders made on Interlocutory Motions in the Chancery Division. Separate List.

1887.

(Original Motion.)

Kelly v Kelly app of plit for leave to amend statement of claim in pending app from Mr Justice Chitty

Probate Baxile v Attorney-Gen app of petitor from Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Butt refusing new trial—cause tried by the President with a jury July 11

Apollinaris Co, Id v Herrfeldt & Campbell app of dfts from order of Mr Justice Chitty, dated 29 July, restraining use of word Apollinaris Aug 11

In re William, Elze, one, &c app of J W Hamming from order of Mr Justice North dated 23 July, refusing application for reference to tax bill Aug 3

Boswell v Coaks app of dft from order of Mr Justice North, dated 9 Aug, refusing restraint of execution for interest on t-xed case Aug 15

St John Marius v Oliver app of plit from order of Mr Justice Chitty, dated Aug 12, refusing injunction for alleged breach of t-xanary agreement Sept 2

Dowager Baroness Stanley of Alderley v Alexander app of dft from order of Mr Justice North, dated 6 Aug, for attachment Sept 2

In re Hermann Lrg, Id & Co's Act Expts Anderson app of Jas Anderson from refusal of Mr Justice North, dated 11 Aug, of liberty as agent to sell Co's effects and pay debts Sept 3

Divorce Mary Ann Wood v Ebenezer Wood app of respondent from Mr Justice Kekewich (sitting as Vice Judge) refusing to rescind order of registrar allotting alimony pendente lite Sept 9

Freson v Etherington app of dft from order of Mr Justice Kekewich (sitting as Vice Judge) for attachment for non-payment (stayed pending appeal) Sept 10

McWean v Smith app of plit from Mr Justice Charles (sitting as Vice Judge) re using continuance of injunction Sept 12

Appeals from the County Palatine Court of Lancaster.

From Interlocutory Orders.

1886.

In re Thos Kitty, Geat, one, &c, and *In re Toxteth Brewery Co & Co's Act* and Chancery Lancaster Ac's app of liquidator from refusal of Vice-Chancellor to direct account and payment of assets in hands of solicitor Oct 4 (S O till Bills taxed)

1887.

Harley v Hunt app of plit from order of the Vice-Chancellor dated 26 July, varying Registrar's certificate of tax in Aug 19

From Final Orders and Judgments.

1887.

Clowes v McFarlane app of plit from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor, dated 26 Feb, 1887 April 7

The Southport & West Lancashire Banking Co v Thompson app of plit from judgt of the Vice-Chancellor, dated 16 March, 1887 April 16

In re W Swift, dec McEvoy v Tickle app of dft M A Phillips from order of the Vice-Chancellor, dated 24 Feb on petition April 16

In re W Carruthers, dec Carruthers v Carruthers app of plit from refusal of the Vice-Chancellor, dated 5 April, to vary Registrar's certificate April 27

In re Liverpool Victoria Loan and Banking Co, Id & Co's Act and Lancaster Ac's app of the Co from order of the Vice-Chancellor, dated 23 Aug for winding up Co Sept 21

N B.—The County Palatine Appeals as the dates of setting down are reached in the General and Separate Lists are set aside and taken on the first Thursday in every sitting, and afterwards on the first Thursday in the following months during the Sittings.

N B.—During Michaelmas Sittings Palatine Appeals (if any reached) will be taken on the following days, viz:—

Thursday, October 27.

Thursday, November 3.

Thursday, December 1.

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY (ADMIRALTY) DIVISIONS.

For Hearing.

1887.

Ship Bertha (claim for loss of life) Sellstrom & ors v Bristol Steam Navn Co app of plit from judgt of Mr Justice Butt, dated 1 Mar 22, 1886 Feb 18 (without assessors—S O pending appl to House of Lords in Ship Bertha)

The Adelphi Bank, Id, v The Halifax Sugar Refining Co, Id app of plit from Justices Day and Wills directing entry of judgt for debts—action tried by Mr Justice Cave at Liverpool with a jury March 31

Hamer v James & anr app of plit from judgt of Lord Justice Lopes at trial in Middlesex with a jury April 6

Banister v Cliff app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial in Middlesex April 5

Jones & anr v Williams, Gittins, & anr (garnishee) app of dfts from judgt of Mr McIntyre, Q.C., sitting as Commissioner after trial at Walspool April 6

The Mayor, &c, of the Company of Merchants of the Staple of England v Bank of England app of plit from order of Justices Day and Wills on motion after trial before Baron Pollock reserving leave to move to enter judgt. The Mayor &c of the Staple of England v The Bank of England app of dfts from same order April 7

Great Northern Ry Co v Kennedy & anr app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial in Middlesex without a jury April 13

City of London Contract Corporation, Id v Styles (Q B Revenue Side) app of Contract Corporation from judgt of Justices A L Smith and Grantham on case stated by Commissioners of Income Tax April 13

Holmes v The Twickenham Local Board of Health (Q B Crown Side) app of The Local Board from judgt of Baron Huddleston and Mr Justice A L Smith setting aside order of Justices affirming rate *Bosella v Saue Local Board (Q B Crown Side)* app of The Local Board from like order April 14

Duke of Devonshire & ors (on behalf, &c.) v Pattinson & Myers, &c., of Carlisle app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice A. L. Smith on fur coa after trial at Carlisle Same Act on app of pils from part of same judgt April 16

Harker & anr v Edwards app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial in Middlesex April 21

Hammond & Co v Bussey app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial in Middlesex without a jury April 25

So ly v Grogan app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Cave at trial in Middlesex without a jury April 28

The Hire Purchase Furnishing Co ld v Richens & anr app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Gresham at trial in Middlesex without a jury April 29

Langley v Davies app of pils from judgt of Mr Justice Wills at trial with a jury at Cardiff May 5

The Real and Personal Alvanco Co ld v D J Cleave (Q B Crown Side) app of pils from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice A. L. Smith on app from County Court affirming no assuit May 6

Wilson v Glossop (Q B Crown Side) app of dft from order of Justices Mathew and Cave directing entry of judgt for pils May 13 (Security ordered June 15)

Shaw, Savill & Albion Co ld v The Ball Coleman Mechanical Refrigerating Co app of pils from part of judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice A. L. Smith as to damages after trial with special jury May 13

Burrell v Mossop app of pils from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial in Middlesex without a jury May 16

Whitaker & anr v Dunn app of pils from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice A. L. Smith setting aside decision of Official Referee—action referred at trial before Baron Pollock in Middlesex May 16

Glaberg v Randall app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Hawkins for Mr Justice Kay at trial with a jury in Middlesex May 25

Fresh & anr (exors) v Allen app of pils from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in Middlesex without a jury May 27

Whitby and Wife v G T Brock & Co app of pils from judgt of Mr Justice Gresham at trial in Middlesex with a jury June 1

(To be continued.)

FROM ORDERS MADE ON INTERLOCUTORY MOTIONS IN THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

1887.

M A Trower (extrix) v Law Life Assoc Soc app of pils from Justices Day and Wills refusing new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Grove in Middx (heard 28 July, 1888) restored by order

Orgley & Co v Local Board of Chatham app of dft from judgt of Justices Mathew and Cave on special case as to liability subject to assessment of a magis July 1

Pickering v North Eastern Ry Co app of pils from Justices Field and Wills on app for new trial, setting aside verdict and judgt—action tried by Mr Justice Hawkins at Manchester with a jury July 7

Stephens v Harris & Co app of pils from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Day on app for new trial, setting aside verdict and judgt—action tried by Mr Justice Cave at Durham with a jury July 7

Thomas v Owen app of dft from Justices Mathew and Cave refusing new trial—action tried by Mr McIntyre, QC, as Commissioner at Anglesey with a jury July 8

Finley v Chirnsey & anr app of dfts from order of Justices Field and Wills for new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Cave at Northumberland July 14

The Queen v Poulter & ors (Q B Crown Side) app of the London, Tilbury and Southend Ry Co from the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice Denman discharging rule nisi for certiorari for inquisition July 14

In re application by the Rev J Bell Cox to the Queen's Bench Division for a writ of habeas corpus app of J Hakes from order of the Lord Chief Justice and Mr Justice A. L. Smith for discharge from custody July 15

Bryant v Gooch & anr app of pils (in forma pauperis) from order of Justices Denman and Mathew for new trial—action tried by Mr Justice Grove with special jury July 19

Armour v Marshall app of dft from Justices Mauley and Wills affirming refusal to stay action as contrary to Building Societies' Act, 1874 July 22

(To be continued.)

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1887.

Causes for Trial or Hearing.

(Set down to Saturday, October 15, inclusive.)

Motions, Petitions, and Short Causes will be taken on the usual days, as stated in the Trinity Sittings Paper.

Causes with and without Witnesses will be taken by Mr. Justice Kay on the usual Cause days in the order as they stand in the Cause Book.

Mr. Justice Chitty will take Witness Causes on the following days, viz.:—Nov 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, and Dec 1.

Mr. Justice North will take Witness Causes on the following days:—Oct 31, Nov 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

Mr. Justice Stirling will take Witness Actions on days to be named by his Lordship; his Lordship will sit in Chambers every Monday during the Sittings.

Mr. Justice Kekewich will take Witness Causes every day, in the order as they stand in the Cause Book. See Note on Sittings Paper as to Liverpool and Manchester District Registry Business.

Adjoined Summonses will be taken as follows:—Mr. Justice Kay, on Fridays and Saturdays; Mr. Justice Chitty, with Non-Witness Actions, except Procedure Summonses, which (if any) are taken every Saturday; Mr. Justice Stirling, on Fridays and Saturdays.

N.B.—Mr. Justice North will take Adjoined Summonses as follows:—Oliver 1, with Motions, on Fridays; Classes II. and III., in the Non-Witness List; Class IV., on Fridays and Saturdays. For description of each Class see notice issued by his Lordship's Chief Clerk, dated May 1, 1884.

Before Mr. Justice KAY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses and without witnesses).

In re Meyrick Mannmann Glitt v Lowndes act

Eden v Weardale Iron Co, ld act with

Ecological Commrs v Sir W Eden act with

Rawlinson v Mullens act (restored)

Lowther v Curwen act with

Kirby v Freeman act with

In re Stuart Mansion House Chambers v Stuart act

Venn v Hendricks act with

Elmore v Purvis act with

Athlone v Same act with

In re Hardbottle v Hardbottle v Hardbottle act with

Thornhill v Hoy and act with

Goodall v Pemberton act and m f j

Pemberton v Goodall act & summs

Wills v Joyce act with

Peach v Selby-Lowndes act

Welchman v Lush act with

Elliot v Merrill act with

Britain v Hirsch, Pritchard, & Co act with

Ellington v Clark, Barnett, & Co, ld act with

Beakerville v Iron & Steel Works Assoc, ld act with

Backridge v Patman act with

Brown v Alabaster act with

Scovell v Robison act with

Spalding v Skoulding act & counter claim

Rogers v Barry Docks and Ry Co act

Stor v Stier m f j

Andrews v Barnes act with

Judge v Tisdall act with

Godwin v Rathbone act & m f j with

Hutton v Russell act

Munro v Met & Mt Dist Ry Co act with

Barnard v Hoare act with

Wilks v Newman act with

Ryder v Anders act

Robman v Hughes act with

Sampson v Stratham & Genl Estate Co, ld act with

Clarke v Lane m f j

In re L Harbord & Patent Designs & Co act

Shann v Smith act with

In re Farber Roke v Bladdy act

Bowden v Bywater act & m f j

Etienne & Swan & Co v Holland act

M Leonard v Jackson act & m f j

Hallinger v Dunn & Duncan act with

Hawkins v Hawkins m f j

In re W Moss Lloyd's, Barnett's & Bonanquet's Bk v Moss act

Brian v Falkner act

Moore v Partidge act with

Cufford v Cliff act with

In re London Celluloid Co & Co's Acts

Quait v Eastwood act with

White v Peto Bros act with

Booker v Robinson act with

Hansom v Virtue act with

Madon v Van act with

In re Maxwell Mitchell v Maxwell act

Vickers v Mayor, &c., of Folkestone act with

India Rubber, &c., Co v Henley's Telegraph, &c., Co act with

Watson v Smith act with

Taitman v Lowe act with

Batcher v Galmoye act with

Dyer v Wilkinson act with

Armstrong v Hall act with

Born (trading, &c.) v Parker Bros act with

Curtis & Harvey v Chilworth Gunpowder Co, ld act with

To be continued.

Further Considerations.

Brown v Bardett f c

Humphreys v Rafferty f c

In re Leo Leo v Pope f c

In re Parker Parker v Baxter f c

Adjoined Summonses.

In re Cotton Fensmore v Nicholls

In re Martin's Will re Trollope's Will

Jarvis v Martin

In re Brankens Island Co, ld & Co's Acts

In re British Empire Match Co, ld & Co's Acts

Before Mr. Justice CHITTY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses)

Hopkinson v Peruvian Guano Co act

(restored, but not till further order or consent of parties)

Baroness Wenlock v Myder act (transferred from Q B Div)

Reynolds v Norris act (restored)

Harlich v Miles & anr act

Samp v Guddy, Cripps & Sons, ld act

Attorney-General v Anderson Anderson v Hawkins claim and counter claim

In re W. T. Clark, dec Mose v Clark

adj summs with wits by order

Callow v Young motn with wits by order

Ingram v Clarke act

Clarke v Ingram act

E Blakey & Sons v Latham & Co act

E Blakey & Sons v Lee act

E Blakey & Sons v Hall act

E Blakey & Sons v Cooke act

E Blakey & Sons v Topholme act

E Blakey & Sons v Hargrave act

Mansford v Bell act

Yates v Watkins act

Sampson v Mills act (transferred from Q B Div)

Ballock v Horsford act (transferred from Q B Div)

Alder v Thompson act

Clift & ors v Foster act

In re T Seymour, dec Seymour v Seymour act

Baker v Jeffries act

Stonctford v Godfrey act

Richards v Walker act

Marks v Angli-Montana Mining Co act

Gold v Birmingham, Dudley & District Banking Co act

To be continued.

Non-witness Causes, Adjoined Summonses and Special Causes.

In re Thompson's Settlement Bishop v Shephard Ex parte pils adj summs

Penon v Guitfield m f j

In re Hollingbourne Paper Co, ld (Harbour's claim) adj summs

Justice v Fooks act Fooks v Barton adj summs

In re Withers, dec Withers v Withers adj summs

In re Jones, dec Daniel v Daniel adj summs

Lory v The Abercorris Slate and Slab Co, ld m f j

Ashenden v Jones act

Tyler v Bank of England act

Ferron v Penin m f j

In re T C Clarke's Estate Bantoft v Aiyward (construction) adj summs

In re G Wood's Estate Short v Wood (gift or loan) adj summs

In re Galland, dec Lidiard v Galland (Order 65) adj summs

In re Wm Wenmoth's Estate Wenmoth v Wenmoth adj sum (ord 65)

In re Lord De Tabley's Settlement (construction) adj summs

In re Oriental Bank Ex parte Official Liquidator adj summs

In re Oriental Bank Ex parte Oriental Bank Ex parte Co, ld adj summs

Butten v Town adj summs

Ward v Royal Exchange Shipping Co adj summs

In re Mary Wilde's Estate Wilde v Salt adj summs

Lawson v Quere act

In re Plymouth Working Men's Equitable Loan Soc adj summs

In re Thornhill's Estate Thornhill v Nixon adj summs

In re Jas Walker's Estate Richard Walker v Archer adj summs

In re Jas Walker's Estate John Walker v Archer adj summs

In re Jas E Cox's Trusts Ex parte E Cox's Legacy adj summs

Rock v Parwell adj summs

Wallis v Commans & V & P Act adj summs

Kennedy v Orrell act 1887—K—133

Kennedy v Orrell act 1886—K—1011

Maver v Harston Jenkins v Newbold con acts

Reid v Gouland adj summs (1)

Reid v Gouland adj summs (2)

In re CG J Silva's Estate Shephard v Royal Medical College In re Le Geyt, infinite adj summs

Mathew v O'Dowd adj summs (1)

Mathew v O'Dowd adj summs (2)

Lewis v Ramsdale adj summs

In re Civil Service & General Store ld Ex parte Sales, Palmer & Co adj summs

In re Jacob Holgreen's Estate, A & B v Holgreen adj summs

In re Thomas Hollinshead's Estate, Hollinshead v Webster adj summs

In re City of Chester Benefit Bldg Soc
(as to rights of members) adj sums
To be continued.

Before Mr. Justice NORTH.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
Nead v Leir act
Walker v James act (revived)
In re T W Cobb Harrison v Cobb
act
Cobb v Harrison act
Barber v Helliwell act
Ruthven v Ruthven act
Prestley v Hodgson act
Morley v Lythall act
Brown v Clark act
Short v London & Westminster Bk Id
act
Russell v Norton act
Drage v Sir W O Hart pp act
Creed v Dixon act
Helliwell v Barker act
Brusat v Burlet act
Lands Allotment Co Id v London &
Tilbury Ry Co act
Finnis v Wilks act
In re Bennett Knapp v Bennett act
In re Knapp Bennett v Knapp act
Horne v Bullock act & m f j
Batesman v Poplar Dist Bd of Works
act
In re Ellis Jones Jones v Evans act
Rickaby v Rickaby act
Wright v Strub act
Charley v Conks act
To be continued. ||

Causes for Trial (without witnesses)
and Adjourned Summonses (Classes
II. and III.).
Carnochan v Ireland act
In re Hulton Lister v Hulton adj
sums
In re Jas Bowley's Estate Bowley v
Bowley adj sums
In re Natt Walker v Gamage adj
sums
Blundell v De Falbe act
In re Vickers Vickers v Vickers adj
sums
In re Southern Wright v Everall
adj sums
In re J Baker Johnson v Baker adj
sums
In re J Baker Simey v Baker
In re Bettsworth, Bettsworth v
Richer adj sums
In re Haigh, Stephens v Lechmere adj
sums
In re Houghton, Mortimer v Caird adj
sums
In re F Allen & Sons & T M Acts adj
sums
In re Treffy, Treffy v Treffy adj
sums
In re Griffin, Beckell v Smith adj sums
In re J Barratt's Will adj sums
In re Holbeck, Markham v Holbeck
adj sums
Wells v Hulton m f j
In re La Fargue, Heath v Hinder adj
sums
In re Nelson, Lane v Holland adj sums
In re M Wyatt Wyatt v Phear adj
sums
In re M Wyatt Furniss v Phear adj
sums
In re Holt, Riches v Jones adj sums
In re Nelson, Brett v Nelson adj sums
In re Vincent Robinson v Vincent adj sums
In re Malet Malet v Malet adj sums
Jackson v Locke adj sums
In re Shere Chaffey v Shere act
In re Hay Hay v Neville adj sums
Booth v Shaw act
In re Hatten Robson v Parlington
adj sums
In re Spooner Spooner v Spooner adj
sums
In re Budd Cuddey v How adj sums
In re Beid Cuddey v How adj sums
In re Roberts Morris v Lewis adj
sums
In re Hutchinson Jones v Perkins adj
sums
In re Edie & Brown & V & P Act,
1874 adj sums
In re Hunt Goring v Gillham adj
sums
In re Phillips Phillips v Allen adj
sums

In re Grant Grant v Boddal adj sums
Thomas v Thomas act
To be continued.

Further Considerations.
In re Wilson Alexander v Calder fur
con
In re Mills Mills v Mills fur con
In re Scott Scott v Goodall fur con
In re Benson Benson v Thompson
fur con
Pearson v Dangerfield fur con
In re Thomas Thomas v Thomas act
Adjourned Summonses.
(Class IV.)
In re Sabright, Burt, and Settled Land
Act
In re Jackson & Woodburne & V & P
Act
In re Johnson Weatherall (Taxation)
Easton v London Joint Stock Bank Co
Thomas v Doughty
In re Peace & Ellis, & Co (Taxation)
Syer v Gladstone (payment of interest)
Syer v Gladstone (supra. of plt)
In re Davis Muscull v Davis
In re Newman Newman v Newman
In re Fraser Gates v Fraser
In re Proom Proom v Proom
United Telephone Co, Id v Nelson &
Sons
Piley v Land Investment Co, Id
In re Bowes Earl of Strathmore v
Vane
In re Barley Trousdale v Hayes

Before Mr. Justice STIRLING.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
Grimmer v Chapman Hewatson v
Grimmer act
Foulkes v Jeffries act
Lamley v Haines act
Lound v Grimwade issue for trial
Lee v Neucha-el Asphalt Co, Id act
Sonnenschein v Bernard and anr act
Broking v Maudslay, Sons & Field
act
Stannore v Mont Dore, of Bourne-
mouth & pta
Cropley v Dando act
Roots v Williams act
Maciver v Maciver act
Insole v Mayor, & Co, of Cardiff act
Moore v Tyles act
In re S England Barnes v Pavey act
In re S England Barnes v Pavey
question of law (to do so on together
by order)
Knaresborough, & Co, Building Co v
Lockme's act
Anglo-American Brush Co v Edison &
Swan & Co act
Anglo-American Brush Co v Edison &
Swan & Co act
Whitely v Freeman act
Kerr v Richardson act
In re Rothwell's Patent, & Co Peta
(w's list by order)
Johnson v Duffield act
Croft v Ferreira act
Croft v Ferreira act
Tarn v Turner act
To be continued.

Causes for Trial (without witnesses)
In re Croome Croome v Croome
(points of law set down by order,
19 July, 1887)
Bacon v Camphaman act
In re Meynell Holmes v Meynell
issue of fact
Molvar v Hill act
In re Wallis Wallis v Wallis special
case (restored)
Rollit v London Asces act
In re Taylor Hughes v Bowley act
Ashton v Chorney act
Knowles v Knowles special case
In re Green Entwistle v Green act
Ladbroke v Parnham act
Smith v Keppoon act
Jenkins v Jackson m f j
Harding v Harding special case
Halsekopf v Hutchinson m f j
Mousley Bartley v Mousley m f j
Porritt v Walk r act & m f j

Further considerations.
In re Wood Wood v Wood fur con
& Tamm

Maitland v Philpot 2nd fur con
In re Marquis of Anglessey Skinner v
Anglessey fur con
In re Remrose Brant v Judd fur con
In re Williams Andrews v Williams
fur con

Adjourned Summonses.
In re Burgess George v Stothard
In re Golding's Trusts Crossley v
Burrows
In re Fryer Ellis v Fryer
In re Sills Sills v Sills
In re Sills Saul v Sills
Robins v Robins
In re Cridland & L C Act
In re Pasche Shepherd v Thorpe
Salway v Salway ptd hd (restored)
In re Cony to Wilson, & V & P Act
In re Wilton & Sons, solrs (taxation)
Cowper v Harmer
In re Benn's Estate Benn v Benn
Prior v Bagster
Stevens v McMillan (restored)
In re Whitehouse Whitehouse v
Edward
Dow v Parker
Dow v Parker
In re A W Hall & Co & Co's Acts
In re De la Rue Cumming v Marshall
In re Wilkinson Waddington v Wad-
dington
In re Corrells Lawton v Elwes
Batty v Call
Batty v Call
In re Simpson Blanford v Simpson
To be continued.

Before Mr. Justice KEEBLE.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
London, Chatham, & Dover Ry Co v
South-Eastern Ry Co act (restored)
In re Harvey Harvey v Lambert act
(act before 15 Nov)
Vasey v Thomas act (restored)
Street v Guardians of Hambleton Union
act
Parker v Bingham
Alexander v London Founders Assoc,
Id act
Williams v North Canal Navigation
Proprietors act and coun'er clam
Transferred from Justice CHITTY,
NORTH, & STIRLING, for Trial or
Hearing only—by Order, dated
24 March, 1887
Freke v Houseman act
Eady v Eady act
Stobbs v Kelsey act
In re Moore Moore v Moore act
Tennant W v Ld Claude Hamilton act
Earl of Darnley v L C & D Ry Co act
(not before 2 Nov)
Clay v Brachen act
Earl Sydney v Lowe act
Lovejoy v Downes act
Baxter v Harfield & Co act
Transferred from Justice NORTH,
CHITTY, and STIRLING, for Trial or
Hearing only—by Order dated 14th
June 1887.
A G Kuria & Co v Peter Spence &
Sons act
To be continued.

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, October 14.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ANLEY HALL COAL AND IRON CO., LIMITED.—Peta for winding up, presented Oct. 14, directed to be heard before North, J., on Saturday, Oct. 20. Bowcliffe, Rawle, & Co., Bedford row, agents for Addleshaw & Warburton, Manchester, solrs for petners.
BRADFORD DISTRICT STEAM TRAMWAYS, LIMITED.—By an order made by Charles, J., dated Oct. 5, it was ordered that the Tramways be wound up. Harper & Battcock, Road lane, solrs for petners.
BRITISH AND COLONIAL AGENCY, LIMITED.—The Vacation Judge has fixed Thursday, Oct. 27, at 11, at the chambers of Chitty, J., for the appointment of an official liquidator.
FARMER, ROBEY, BROWN, & CO., LIMITED.—Peta for winding up, presented Oct. 12, directed to be heard before Stirling, J., on Saturday, Oct. 20. Miles, King & Co., Cheapside, agents for Grange & Warrington, Gt Grimsby, solrs for petners.
RAILWAY DEBTURE STOCK AND MORTGAGE CORPORATION, LIMITED.—By an order of Charles, J., dated Oct. 5, it was ordered that the corporation be wound up. Whitfield, Finsbury pavement, solrs for petner.
SILVER QUEEN UNITED LIMITED.—Peta for winding up, dated Oct. 10, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on Oct. 29. Whitfield, Finsbury pavement, solrs for petner.
UNION MATCH CO., LIMITED.—Peta for winding up, presented Oct. 11, directed to be heard before North, J., on Saturday, Oct. 20. Bradley, Mark lane, solrs for petner.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 18.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BALFOUR & CO., LIMITED.—Peta for winding up, presented Oct. 12, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on Oct. 29. Francis & Johnson, Austria friars, solrs for petner.
CONDENSED WORT AND BREWING MEAL CO., LIMITED.—The Vacation Judge has fixed Thursday, Oct. 27, at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of official liquidator.
MEDICAL DEFENCE UNION, LIMITED.—Peta for winding up, presented Oct. 14, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., on Oct. 29. Yeilding & Co, Vincent sq, Westminster, solrs for petners.
MINING SECURITIES AND INVESTMENT TRUST, LIMITED.—By an order made by Charles, J., dated Oct. 8, it was ordered that the trust be wound up. Maddisons, King's Arms yd, solrs for the petner.
MOREWOOD & CO., LIMITED.—By an order made by Charles, J., dated Oct. 12, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Dawes & Sons, Angel st, Throgmorton st, solrs for petner.
NEW HOLLINGSBURN PAPER MILLS CO., LIMITED.—The Vacation Judge has fixed Oct. 29, at the chambers of North, J., at 12, for the appointment of an official liquidator.
ROSSA GRANDE GOLD MINING CO., LIMITED.—Peta for winding up, presented Aug. 5, directed to be heard before Chitty, J., on Saturday, Oct. 24. A Beckett & Co, Laurence Fountain lane, solrs for petner.
SHEPHERD FORD COAL CO., LIMITED.—Peta for winding up, presented July 20, directed to be heard before North, J., on Saturday, Oct. 20. Harper & Battcock, Road lane, solrs for petner.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

BRITISH EQUITABLE ORDER OF ODD FELLOWS' FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Bricklayers' Arms, Old Kent rd. Oct 14
EYRING STAR LODGE, GRAND UNITED ORDER OF ODD FELLOWS, Bull Inn, Nelson, Lancaster. Oct 14
FRIENDLY BENEFIT SOCIETY, Globe Inn, Wellsborough, Northampton. Oct 14
GLANAGH IRISH FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Glen Moyn, Llanrug, Carmarvon. Oct 14
LOYAL EVANUS SOCIETY, Anchor Inn, Neath, Glamorgan. Oct 14
LOYAL HOUGHTON LODGE, GRAND UNITED ORDER OF ODD FELLOWS, Red Lion Hotel, Pontefract, West Yorkshire. Oct 14
LOYAL VINE OF LODGE LODGE, Bee Hive Inn, Rochdale, Lancashire. Oct 14
PRINCE OF ORANGE BENEFIT SOCIETY, St James Schoolroom, St James rd, Liverpool. Oct 14
WHITCHURCH WORKING MEN'S BICK BENEFIT SOCIETY, Crown and Thistle Inn, Whitechurch, Buckingham. Oct 14

CREDITORS' NOTICES. UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept 30.
DAVIES, GWILYM JOHN, Argued, Mon. Farmer. Nov 2. Davies v Davies.
Tewdall & Son, 22, Henrietta-street, Covent Garden

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct 4.
ALDER, JANE, Ponteland, Northumberland, Farmer. Nov 11. Eledon & Dransfield, Newcastle upon Tyne
BARNES, MARIANNE, Hale End, Woodford. Nov 7. Gush & Co, Finsbury circus
BEECH, FREDERICK, Salford. Dec 1. Dixon, Manchester
BOURNE, JOHN, Queensbury, Halifax, Under Brewer. Oct 7. Walker, Halifax
CHARNOCK, JAMES LAWRENCE, Whitdale, Hambleton. Dec 1. Marchant & Benwell, George yd
CHARR, EDWARD, Plymouth, Coachbuilder. Nov 30. Earl, Plymouth
FISHER, JAMES ERNEST OAKLEY, Cirencester, Esq. Nov 9. Haygarth & Lawrence, Cirencester
HARRIS, JOSEPH HENRY, Stanthorpe rd, Streatham, Wesleyan Minister. Oct 31. Lincoln & Marsh, Lincoln's inn fields
HAWORTH, WILLIAM, Hunningley, York, Linen Manufacturer. Nov 31. Raley & Son, Barnsley
HILL, THOMAS, Redditch, Worcester, Timber Merchant. Oct 31. Harold C Browning, Redditch
JOHN, LEWIS, Trochil, Rhonda Valley, Glamorgan, Baptist Minister. Oct 17. Curtis & Son, Neath
LEE, MATTHEW CHESSET, Bridlington Quay, York. Nov 23. Thorne & Son, Hull
MEAD, ELIZABETH, Hertford. Nov 22. Spence & Co, Hertford
MEAD, SIMON, Hertford, Carpenter. Nov 22. Spence & Co, Hertford
MOSE, MARIA, Park rd, Wandsworth. Nov 18. Jennings, Lincoln's inn chm
NORTH, THOMAS, Daventry, Northampton, Innkeeper. Nov 1. Burton & Willoughby, Daventry
POWELL, THOMAS, Hopwood, Joiner. Oct 31. Grundy, Bury
PRICHARD, JAMES, Camden rd, Meat and Cattle Salesman. Nov 21. Philpott, Bartholomew close
RICHARDS, EDWARD TAY, Havant, Hants, Clerk in Holy Orders. Nov 1. Rashleigh & Smart, Lincoln's inn fields
ROGERS, GEORGE, Hook Norton, Oxford, Farmer. Oct 1. Saunders, Chipping Norton
SAUNDERS, DANIEL, St Michael's, Hertford. Nov 1. Saunders, Chipping Norton
SMITH, WILLIAM, Atherstone, Grocer. Nov 1. Sale, Atherstone
SMITH, WILLIAM, Warwick, Banker. Nov 23. Brabazon Campbell, Jury st, Warwick
STEVENS, WILLIAM, Portsea, Gasfitter. Oct 31. Kent, Portsea
WILKINSON, THOMAS, Skipton in Craven, York, Gent. Nov 23. Thorne & Son, Hull
WITHINGTON, JOHN HENRY, Maddox st. Nov 14. Cunliffe & Davenport, Chancery lane
WOOD, MARY, Hanger Hill, Ealing. Nov 7. Lupton, New sq
YEVES, EDUARDO, Fenchurch st, Ship Broker. Nov 15. Lowless & Co, Martin's lane
London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct 7.
BARKER, GEORGE IVES RAYMOND, Bath, Esq. Dec 1. Wade & Lyall, St Helens pl
BROCKLEMAN, GEORGE, West End of Preston in Holderness, Farmer. Nov 23. Watson & Co, Hull
CHELL, GEORGE FREDERICK, Sandbach, Chester, Licensed Victualler. Oct 13. Homer, Sandbach
DARTON, THOMAS, Guleborough, York, Butcher. Dec 1. Cowling & Co, York
DAVIES, ANNE, Garndiffaith, Monmouth. Dec 7. Goodenough, Sebastopol, nr Newport
EBERT, JOHN. Oct 31. Yedding & Co, Vincent sq
FERON, WILLIAM, Warstead, Essex, Fish Salesman. Nov 7. Martin, Fenchurch st
GOODCHILD, ANNE, Hartley Wintney, Hants. Nov 18. Lamb & Co, Odiham
GREENHAM, ELIZABETH, Liverpool. Nov 14. Miller & Co, Liverpool
HALLARD, HENRY, Knutsford, Chester, Gent. Dec 1. Allen & Co, Manchester
HILL, WILLIAM, Bethune rd, Stoke Newington. Nov 7. Gossell, Finsbury pavement
HODGES, JAMES, Kingston upon Thames. Nov 18. Naunton & Son, Chesham
HOLMES, TOM BURTON, Risley, Derby, Merchant. Nov 30. Broomhead & Co, Sheffield
JACKSON, GEORGE HERBERT, Cambridge, Ironmonger. Oct 23. Camm & Corbridge, Sheffield
KELLY, EDMUND JAMES, Brecknock rd. Nov 14. Hilder, Gravesend
KELLY, JAMES WOOD, Pyrland rd, Canonsbury, Gent. Nov 15. Lowless & Co, Martin's lane
MARTIN, RICHARD, Kirkdale, York, Yeoman. Nov 3. Hugh W & R Pearson, Melton
MAYER, JOHN, Antrobus, Chester, Retired Farmer. Nov 10. A & J B Fletcher, Northwich
MEAD, ELIZABETH, Hertford. Nov 22. Spence & Co, Hertford
MEAD, SIMON, Hertford, Carpenter. Nov 22. Spence & Co, Hertford
MILVILL, SIR MAXWELL, Bombay. Nov 3. Bridges & Co, Red Lion sq
MITCHELL, JOHN, Clayton le Moors, Lancaster, Farmer. Nov 7. Sharples, Accrington
MORRIS, THOMAS, Blanywern, Llanganillo, Esq. Nov 3. Davies, Llandysul
MORTON, HENRIETTA GILES, Newcastle on Tyne. Nov 31. Tippetts & Son, Maiden lane
POWELL, THOMAS, Mountain Ash, Glamorgan, Gent. Nov 14. Linton & Knapdale, Abershire
QUICK, JAMES, Addison ter, Notting hill, Gent. Nov 11. Cooper & Dake, Portman sq
ROME, CHARLES, North Cadbury, Somerset, Esq. Nov 23. St Barbe Sladen & Wing, Delahay st
SMITH, JAMES, Buxton st, Clerkenwell, Carpenter. Nov 31. Withal & Co, Bedford row
SONLEY, ELIZABETH, Newton, York. Oct 31. Hugh W & R Pearson, Helmsley
STOTT, ANNE, Eagle Brow, Lymn. Nov 15. Standing & Taylor, Rochdale

STRACY, MARIANNE BURFOOT, Scarborough. Nov 1. Drawbridge & Rowatton, Scarborough
THACKRAY, HENRY, Honley, York, out of business. Nov 15. Hall & White, Huddersfield
TYLER, JOSEPH, Gallowooddale, Pattern Maker. Nov 1. Bennett & Co, Chapel en le Frith, nr Stockport
VAUDREY, WILLIAM, King Hants, Esq. Dec 1. Garnett & Tabor, Liverpool
WALKER, SARAH, Clifton. Nov 21. Stone & Co, Bath
WALKING, EDMUND BROOMFIELD, Shoreham, Wheelwright. Nov 11. Holcroft & Co, Sevenoaks
WHITE, SAMUEL, Bingley, York, Tanner. Nov 7. Lee, Bradford

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS AND LESSEES.—Before purchasing or renting a house have the Sanitary arrangements thoroughly examined by an expert from The Sanitary Engineering & Ventilation Co., 12, Victoria-st., Westminster (Kish, 1878), who also undertake the Ventilation of Offices, &c.—[ADVT.]

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, October 14.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ANDERSON, AMY JANE, East Riding of Yorks, Dealer in Baby Linen. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
BAGHOUSE, THOMAS, Cullinham, Cumberland, Yeoman. Carlisle. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10
BARKER, ROBERT, Cliviger, nr Burnley, Farmer. Burnley. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10
BARNETT, HENRY, Whitstable, Kent, Diver. Canterbury. Pet Oct 31. Ord Oct 31
BATES, WILLIAM JOHN, Winchester, Builder. Winchester. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10
BRADSHAW, GEORGE FREDERICK, Chapelton, nr Sheffield, Engineer. Barnsley. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10
BELL, ROBERT, Ratrick, nr Halifax, Joiner. Halifax. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
BLAND, FREDERICK, Fordham, Cambs, Farmer. Cambridge. Pet Sept 12. Ord Oct 12
BLAKE, J G, Norfolk st, Strand, Proprietor of Theatrical Companies. High Court. Pet Sept 11. Ord Oct 10
BLEASDE, HERBERT WILLIAMSON, Huyton, nr Liverpool, Provision Merchant. Liverpool. Pet Sept 31. Ord Oct 12
BRIARS, GOODWIN, Luton, Grocer. Luton. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
CARRICK, GEORGE, Melkridge, nr Haltwhistle, Innkeeper. Carlisle. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10
COTTON, NATHANIEL, Chesterton rd, Notting hill, Commander R.N. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Sept 18. Ord Oct 10
COX, EDWARD CALER, Stoneham, Hants, no occupation. Southampton. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
CURRIER, ROBERT ELLIS, Park st, Grosvenor sq, Grocer. High Court. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10
DIX, JOHN, Maiden lane, Covent garden, Club Proprietor. High Court. Pet Sept 16. Ord Oct 12
EDOLEY, ROBERT WILLIAM, Gurney st, Walworth, Builder. High Court. Pet Sept 15. Ord Oct 12
FAITH, HENRY, Cambridge road, Mile End Gate, Cheesemonger. High Court. Pet Sept 10. Ord Oct 12
FORESTER, JOSEPH, Great Yarmouth, Draper. Great Yarmouth. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10
HENNMAN, JOHN, Hunton, Kent, Blacksmith. Maidstone. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 11
HOLMAN, MARY ANN, Folkestone, Hostler. Canterbury. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10
JONES, ALICE, Hale Bank, nr Liverpool, Grocer. Liverpool. Pet Sept 27. Ord Oct 11
JONES, JOHN, Llanguicke, Glamorganshire, Farmer. Neath. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
JONES, ROBERT WALLER, Brook Green, Hammersmith, a Retired Lieut Colonel. High Court. Pet Aug 31. Ord Oct 12
JOY, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Colchester, Engineer. Colchester. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
LAWRENCE, HENRY THOMAS, Moseley, Worcestershire, Butcher. Birmingham. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
LEWIS, DAVID LLOYD, Carmarthen, Painter. Carmarthen. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
LEWIS JOHN OWEN, Mitcham, Florist. Croydon. Pet Sept 22. Ord Oct 7
LOVEADY, CHARLES PERKINS, and EVANS, JOHN EDWARD, Swansea, Builder, Swansea. Pet Sept 27. Ord Oct 7
MORRIS, EDWARD JOHN THOMAS, Bristol, Clerk. Bristol. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 11
MORRIS, GEORGE, EDWARD, Eastgate, Lincoln, Joiner. Lincoln. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
MOULAND, GEORGE, Trowbridge, Wilts, Dealer in Cloth. Bath. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
O'KEEFE, JAMES WILLIAM, Burdett road, Bow, out of business. High Court. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
PHILLIPS, JOHN BALDWIN, and THOMAS RICHARD PHILLIPS, Liverpool, Dealers, Liverpool. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
PLOWMAN, FREDERIC DAKON, Newport Mon, House Furniture. Newport Mon. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
PRICE, WILLIAM, Great Grimshy, Mason. Great Grimshy. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
PROCTOR, HOWARD, Essex rd, Islington, Blacksmith. High Court. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
SCHOLLS, JOHN, and RAYNER DRAKE, Moss Side, Lancashire, Upholsterers, Wapchoumen. Manchester. Pet Sept 24. Ord Oct 12
SHIRDS, ELIZABETH, St Ives, Cornwall, Fish Buyer. Truro. Pet Oct 20. Ord Oct 10
STICK, NICHOLAS, Buntingford, Hertfordshire, Farmer. Cambridge. Pet Sept 28. Ord Oct 8
TATHAM, EDWARD, High Wycombe, Surgeon. Reading. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
THOMAS, WILLIAM, Glynneath, Glamorganshire, Coal Merchant. Neath. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
VIGGERS, DAVID, Birmingham, Grocer. Birmingham. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
WILLIAMS, ROBERT, Nevin, Carmarthen, Mariner. Bangor. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12
YOUNG, THOMAS, Spon, Builder. Windsor. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11
The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the *London Gazette* of October 4.
BOWMAN, HENRY CROWTHER, and ALBERT THOMAS BOWMAN, Manchester, Stock Brokers. Manchester. Pet Aug 18. Ord Sept 20

FIRST MEETINGS.

ALLISON, JOHN, Liverpool, Team Owner. Oct 24 at 3. Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool.

ANSPACH, LEOPOLD, Edmund pl, Aldersgate st, Costume Manufacturer. Oct 21 at 12. 23, Carey st, Lincoln's Inn.

BACKHOUSE, THOMAS, Holme Cultram, Cumberland, Yeoman. Oct 24 at 5. Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle.

BAINTON, HENRY, Stanningley, Yorks, Mason. Oct 24 at 11. Off Rec, 23, Park row, Leeds.

BATE, GEORGE, Birmingham, Gun Manufacturer. Oct 25 at 11. 25, Colmore row, Birmingham.

BAYNE, WILLIAM JOHN, Winchester, Builder. Oct 24 at 2.30. Off Rec, 4, East st, Southampton.

BEAL, ALFRED JOHN, Buckingham rd, Kingland, Publican. Oct 21 at 3. 100, Victoria st, Westminster.

BLAND, FREDERICK, Fordham, Cambridgeshire, Farmer. Oct 27 at 11.30. White Hart Hotel, Soham.

BOWMAN, HENRY CROWTHER, and **ALBERT THOMAS BOWMAN**, Manchester, Stock Brokers. Oct 24 at 11.30. Off Rec, Ogden's chmrs, Bridge st, Manchester.

BRAY, NICHOLAS, St Kew, Cornwall, Carpenter. Oct 22 at 2. Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro.

CABRINES, ROBERT RICHARDS, St Ives, Cornwall, Gardener. Oct 23 at 12. Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro.

CARRICK, GEORGE, Melkridge, nr Haltwhistle, Innkeeper. Oct 24 at 4. Off Rec, 24, Fisher st, Carlisle.

COLLISON, GEORGE FREDERICK HAMPTON, Chancery lane, Solicitor. Oct 21 at 1. 22, Carver st, Lincoln's Inn.

COOK, THOMAS WESLEY, Liverpool, Importer of Provisions. Oct 25 at 2. Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool.

DWELLEY, CHARLES, Bow rd, Coach Builder. Oct 21 at 12. Bankruptcy bdgs, Portual st, Lincoln's Inn fields.

EDWARDS, WILLIAM, Ferry Barr, Stafford, out of business. Oct 24 at 11. 25, Colmore row, Birmingham.

GEORGE, THOMAS, Ashton under Lyne, Builder. Nov 24 at 2. Townhall, Ashton under Lyne.

GIBSON, BENJAMIN, Llawhaden, Pembroke, Farmer. Oct 25 at 11.15. Rutten Arms Hotel, Narberth.

HAWKINS, CHARLES EDWARD, Derby, Plumber. Oct 21 at 2. Off Rec, St James's chmrs, Derby.

HENDY, FREDERICK CHARLES, Cowley rd, Uxbridge, Builder. Oct 24 at 1.30. Chequers Hotel, Uxbridge.

HENHAM, JOHN, Hunton, Kent, Blacksmith. Oct 25 at 3. Off Rec, Week st, Maidstone.

HUNT, CORNELIUS, Bournemouth, Provision Dealer. Oct 21 at 2.30. Off Rec, Salisbury.

ISAACSON, WILLIAM, Jun, Depden, Suffolk, Farmer. Oct 21 at 12.45. Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds.

JENKINS, THOMAS, Pontardawe, Glamorgan, out of business. Oct 22 at 11. Off Rec, 6, Rutland st, Swansea.

JONES, DAVID HOPKIN, Cardiff, Accountant. Oct 24 at 2.30. Off Rec, 3, Crookherbtown, Cardiff.

JONES, JOHN, Raabon, Denbigh, Printer. Oct 21 at 3. Off Rec, Crypt chmrs, Chester.

JONES, JOHN LEWIS, Merthyr Tydfil, Tea Dealer. Oct 21 at 3. Off Rec, Merthyr Tydfil.

LOVEDAY, CHARLES PERKINS, and **JOHN EDWARD EVANS**, Swansea, Builders. Oct 21 at 3. Off Rec, 6, Rutland st, Swansea.

MILLER, EDWARD, Bishopston, Gloucestershire, Bank Clerk. Oct 21 at 3. Off Rec, Bank chmrs, Bristol.

MONEY, JAMES HENRY, Ironmonger lane, Surveyor. Oct 21 at 11. 23, Carey st, Lincoln's Inn.

NORMAN, WILLIAM, Southtown, Suffolk, Stationer. Oct 21 at 2. Star Hotel, Ot Yarmouth.

PARKINS, THOMAS, Carlisle, Fish Hook Maker. Oct 24 at 12. Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle.

RATHNAM, FREDERICK, Forest Hill, Builder. Oct 24 at 3. 109, Victoria st, Westminster.

ROBINSON, LEWIS, Barry in Furness, Fishmonger. Oct 26 at 10. 2, Paxton ter, Barry in Furness.

STAMMER, ARTHUR, Folkestone, Tailor. Oct 21 at 10. 47, St George's st, Canterbury.

STICE, NICHOLAS, Buntingford, Herts, Farmer. Oct 22 at 12. Off Rec, 5, Petty Cur, Cambridge.

TAYLOR, WALTER JAMES, Weston Zoyland, Somersetshire, General Shop Keeper. Oct 21 at 11. Bristol Arms Hotel, Bridgewater.

WALKER, GEORGE, Dudley, Worcestershire, Draper. Oct 21 at 11. Dudley Arms Hotel, Dudley.

WHITEHEAD, WALTER, Fleetwood, Lancashire, Hairdresser. Oct 24 at 2. Townhall, Fleetwood.

WILLIAMS, ELL, Netherton, Worcestershire, Chain Manufacturer. Oct 21 at 11. Dudley Arms Hotel, Dudley.

WYNNE, MARGARET, Dudley, Goods Dealer. Oct 25 at 11.30. Off Rec, Dudley.

ADJUDICATIONS.

ANDERSON, EDGAR, Market pl, Oxford st, Brass Manufacturer. High Court. Pet Aug 28. Ord Oct 11.

BACKHOUSE, THOMAS, Wash, Holme Cultram, Cumberland, Yeoman. Carlisle. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10.

BEAL, ALFRED JOHN, Buckingham rd, Kingland, late Publican. Wandsworth. Pet June 16. Ord Oct 5.

BELL, ROBERT, Rastrick, nr Halifax, Joiner. Halifax. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12.

BLAND, FREDERICK, Fordham, Cambridgeshire, Farmer. Cambridge. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12.

CARRICK, GEORGE, Melkridge, nr Haltwhistle, Northumberland, Innkeeper. Carlisle. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10.

DARTON, THOMAS GATES, and **DARTON, EDWARD HACK**, Kirby st, Hatton Garden, Book Binders. High Court. Pet Aug 11. Ord Oct 11.

ELVINE, FREDERICK, Kirby Cross, nr Colchester, Engine Driver. Colchester. Pet Oct 3. Ord Oct 11.

FIELD, TOM, and **ORD RICHARDSON**, Go-forth, Northumberland, Builder. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Sept 1. Ord Oct 12.

FORESHILL, JOSEPH, Great Yarmouth, Draper. Great Yarmouth. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10.

GEORGE, THOMAS, Ashton under Lyne, Builder. Ashton under Lyne and Stalybridge. Pet Oct 5. Ord Oct 10.

GREEN, THOMAS JOHN, Coventry, Hosier. Coventry. Pet Sept 21. Ord Oct 12.

GRIFFITHS, JOHN, Walton, nr Liverpool, Master Builder. Liverpool. Pet Sept 4. Ord Oct 12.

HENHAM, JOHN, Hunton, Kent, Blacksmith. Maidstone. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 11.

HOLMES, ROBERT, Ferry Hall, Northumberland, Builder. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Sept 24. Ord Oct 12.

JACKSON, WILLIAM ASKEW, Darlington, Ale Merchant. Stockton on Tees and Middlesbrough. Pet Aug 27. Ord Oct 11.

JENKINS, THOMAS, Pontardawe, Glamorgan, out of business. Neath. Pet Oct 5. Ord Oct 12.

JEWSON, ALFRED WILLIAM, Scarborough, Innkeeper. Scarborough. Pet Oct 5. Ord Oct 12.

JONES, ALICE, Halebank, nr Liverpool, Grocer. Liverpool. Pet Sept 26. Ord Oct 12.

JONES, EDMUND MATHEW, Aberkoff, nr Bridgend, Grocer. Cardiff. Pet Oct 3. Ord Oct 8.

JONES, EDWARD, Newtown, Montgomery, Tin Plate Worker. Newtown. Pet April 29. Ord Oct 7.

JONES, JOHN, Llangulicke, Glamorgan, Farmer. Neath. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12.

JOSEPH, R, Goddman st, Mantle Manufacturer. High Court. Pet Oct 6. Ord Oct 11.

MATTHEWS, JOHN WILLIAM, Folkestone, Painter. Canterbury. Pet Sept 2. Ord Oct 10.

MCWALKER, WILLIAM, Darlington, Draper. Stockton on Tees and Middlesbrough. Pet Aug 12. Ord Oct 11.

MARTON, WILLIAM, Boston, Lincolnshire, Printer. Boston. Pet Sept 19. Ord Oct 12.

MILLER, EDWARD, Blahopston, Gloucester, Clerk. Bristol. Pet Oct 7. Ord Oct 12.

MORGAN, EDWARD JOHN THOMAS, Bristol, Clerk. Bristol. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 12.

MORRIS, GEORGE EDWARD, Lincoln, Joiner. Lincoln. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11.

MOULAND, GEORGE, Trowbridge, Wilts, Dealer in Cloth. Bath. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12.

MURRAY, ALEXANDER, Newcastle on Tyne, Brickmaker. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Sept 8. Ord Oct 12.

O'KNEFFE, JAMES WILLIAM, Burdett rd, Bow, out of business. High Court. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11.

ORPEN, C H, Gosport, Hants, Lieutenant. Portsmouth. Pet June 27. Ord Oct 7.

PLOWMAN, FREDERICK DAMON, Newport, Mon, House Furnisher. Newport, Mon. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 12.

PRICE, WILLIAM, Gt Grimsby, Mason. Gt Grimsby. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12.

ROBERTSON, JOSEPH, Tokenhouse yd, Financial Agent. High Court. Pet July 28. Ord Aug 31.

ROLFE, JAMES, Sheffield, Beerhouse Keeper. Sheffield. Pet Sept 30. Ord Oct 12.

ROSHIER, CHARLES THOMAS, Bridgend, Licensed Victualler. Cardiff. Pet Oct 2. Ord Oct 3.

SIMMONS, GEORGE HENRY, Bulth, Breconshire, Jeweller. Newtown. Pet Sept 21. Ord Oct 7.

STITH, ELIZABETH, St Ives, Cornwall, Fish Buyer. Truro. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 12.

WILLIAMS, ROBERT, Nevil, Carnarvonshire, Mariner. Bangor. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 18.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BAILEY, FRED, Colne, Lancashire, Warp Dresser. Burnley. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

BARKER, WILLIAM, Charnock-Richard, Lanes, Innkeeper. Bolton. Pet Sept 30. Ord Oct 13.

BIRBECK, W H, Burslem, Commission Agent. Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall. Pet Oct 6. Ord Oct 6.

BIRCHALL, FREDERICK, Liverpool, Jeweller. Liverpool. Pet Oct 14. Ord Oct 15.

BULLER, JOSEPH, Lower Sydenham, Kent, Builder. Greenwich. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11.

CARLE, JOHN, Weelsby, nr Great Grimsby, Smackowner. Great Grimsby. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

CONRATH, EDWARD FREDERICK, Weymouth terrace, Hackney road, Proprietor of Moulding Works. High Court. Pet Oct 15. Ord Oct 15.

DAVIES, WILLIAM, Rhosymedre, nr Ruabon, Denbighshire, Grocer. Wrexham. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

DODD, JOHN HENRY, Southwell, Nottinghamshire, Beerhouse Keeper. Nottingham. Pet Oct 15. Ord Oct 15.

DREW, GEORGE, Chalk Farm road, Licensed Victualler. High Court. Pet Oct 15. Ord Oct 15.

FIELD, CHARLES, Bromley, Kent, Bootmaker. Croydon. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 13.

FREEMAN, JOHN, Plymouth, Licensed Victualler. East Stonehouse. Pet Oct 7. Ord Oct 13.

GATES, LUDINGTON, Wroxham, Norfolk, Farmer. Norwich. Pet Oct 15. Ord Oct 15.

GILBERT, ALICE, and **WILLIAM GILBERT**, Shawell, Leicestershire, Farmers. Leicester. Pet Oct 14. Ord Oct 14.

GRIFFITH, HENRY, Llanfairisger, Carnarvonshire, Contractor. Bangor. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

HUMPHREYS, JOHN JOSEPH, Derby, Fishmonger. Derby. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10.

JARDINE, WILLIAM, Great Winchester st, Diamond Merchant. High Court. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

LADD, WALTER WILLOUGHBY, Redland, Bristol, Dairyman. Bristol. Pet Oct 14. Ord Oct 14.

LORD, MARY FANE, Haffgate, Boarding house Keeper. York. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

LOW, JOHN, Rhyl, Innkeeper. Bangor. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12.

LUCENAN, WILLIAM, Coventry, Fruiterer. Coventry. Pet Oct 14. Ord Oct 14.

LUCKENS, WILLIAM, Fletching, Sussex, Builder. Lewis and Eastbourne. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

MILLWARD, W CLEMENT, St Stephen sq, Westbourne pk, Doctor. High Court. Pet Sept 6. Ord Oct 14.

MORRIS, DAVID, Maesteg, Glamorganshire, Collier. Neath. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 12.

REDFERN, JOHN THOMAS, Ashford, nr Bakewell, Derbyshire, Marble Merchant. Derby. Pet Sept 27. Ord Oct 12.

RICHARDS, ALEXANDER CARTER, Okehampton, Devon, Hairdresser. East Stonehouse. Pet Oct 15. Ord Oct 15.

ROLLASON, ALEXANDER EDWARD, Rochester, Clerk. Rochester. Pet Sept 19. Ord Oct 15.

ROWE, WILLIAM CHARLES, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Innkeeper. King's Lynn. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10.

SAUNDERS, FRANCIS WOOLHOUSE, Sandy, Beds, Saddler. Bedford. Pet Oct 15. Ord Oct 15.

SCARR, MATTHEW, Weeton, nr Patrington, Yorks, Farmer. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

SKINFILL, WILLIAM JOHN, Canning Town, Chemist. High Court. Pet Sept 27. Ord Oct 13.

SMITH, JOSEPH JAMES, Maindee, nr Newport, Mon, Builder. Newport, Mon. Pet Oct 14. Ord Oct 14.

WALKER, JAMES, Marquess rd, Canonbury, Woollen Agent. High Court. Pet Sept 25. Ord Oct 13.

WATTS, JOHN, West Bromwich, Staffs, Brewer. Oldbury. Pet Oct 15. Ord Oct 14.

WOOD, SYDNEY FREDERICK, Torquay, Tailor. Exeter. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Sept. 20.

HUDSON, CHARLES JAMES, Oxford, Licensed Victualler. Oxford. Pet Aug 27. Ord Sept 12.

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Oct. 11.

UPTON, EDWARD, Narborough, Leicestershire, Coal Merchant. Leicester. Pet Sept 24. Ord Oct 7.

FIRST MEETINGS.

DARKER, ROBERT, Cliviger, nr Burnley, Farmer. Oct 26 at 3. Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley.

DARKER, WILLIAM, Charnock-Richard, Lancashire, Innkeeper. Oct 27 at 11. 16, Wood st, Bolton.

BARTLETT, HENRY, Whitstable, Kent, Diver. Oct 26 at 3.15. Bear and Key Hotel, Whitstable.

BELL, ROBERT, Rastrick, nr Halifax, Joiner. Oct 25 at 11. Off Rec, Halifax.

BIRBECK, W. H., Burslem, Commission Agent. Oct 27 at 4. Off Rec, Newcastle under Lyme.

BLAKE, J. G., Norfolk st, Strand, Proprietor of Theatrical Companies. Oct 25 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.

BRATHWAITE, THOMAS, Downshire hill, Hampstead, Solicitor. Oct 25 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.

BRIANS, GOODWIN, Luton, Grocer. Oct 26 at 11. Off Rec, Park st West, Luton.

BUTTERWORTH, EDWARD JACKSON, Manchester, Bedding Manufacturer. Oct 25 at 11.30. Off Rec, Ogden's chmbrs, Bridge st, Manchester.

CATTERMOLE, CHARLES, Princess rd, Lambeth, Boot Dealer. Oct 25 at 2.30. 31, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.

COX, EDWARD CALER, Milton, Hampshire, no occupation. Oct 25 at 11. 4, East st, Southampton.

DAVE, THOMAS HENRY, and GEORGE LISTER LAIRD, Liverpool, Paint Manufacturers. Oct 26 at 2. Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool.

DRAY, WILLIAM, Twickenham, Coppermith. Oct 25 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.

DYSON, EDWARD RICHARD, James st, Oxford st, Draper. Oct 27 at 2.30. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.

EVANS, JOHN, Feysyraig, Glamorgan, Grocer. Oct 26 at 12. Off Rec, Merthyr Tydfil.

FRANCIS, THOMAS, Bridgend, Glamorgan, Draper. Oct 25 at 2.30. Off Rec, 3, Crookherbtown, Cardiff.

GRIFFITH, HENRY, Llanfairisger, Carnarvon, Contractor. Nov 3 at 12.30. Queen's Head Cafe, Bangor.

HOLMAN, MARY ANN, Folkestone, Hosier. Oct 27 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn.

HOPKINS, WILLIAM, Leighton Buzzard, Bedfordshire, Butcher. Oct 27 at 1. Off Rec, Park st West, Luton.

HUMPHREYS, JOHN JOSEPH, Derby, Fishmonger. Oct 25 at 3. Off Rec, 31, James's chmbrs, Derby.

HUXLEY, WILLIAM THOMAS, Stockwell pk rd. Oct 26 at 2.30. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.

JONES, JOHN, Llanguicke, Glamorganshire, Farmer. Oct 25 at 11. Off Rec, 6, Rutland st, Swansea.

JONES, THOMAS, Trevel, Carnarvonshire, Settmaker. Nov 3 at 11.30. Queen's Head Cafe, Bangor.

KRAUS, FREDERICK, Weston super Mare, Baker. Oct 26 at 4. Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Bristol.

LADD, WALTER WILLOUGHBY, Redland, Bristol, Dairyman. Nov 4 at 3.30. Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Bristol.

LORD, MARY JANE, Harrogate, Boarding house Keeper. Oct 27 at 12.30. Off Rec, 17, Blake st, York.

MARTIN, WILLIAM, Willesden Green, Builder. Oct 27 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn.

MORGAN, EDWARD JOHN THOMAS, Bristol, Clerk. Oct 26 at 3.30. Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Bristol.

MORRIS, DAVID, Maesteg, Glamorganshire, Collier. Oct 29 at 2. Royal Hotel, Cardiff.

MOUTLAND, GEORGE, Trowbridge, Wilts, Dealer in Cloth. Nov 3 at 3.30. George Hotel, Trowbridge.

NUNN, EDGAR, Thrandeston, Suffolk, Farmer. Oct 25 at 12.15. Off Rec, 2, Westgate st, Ipswich.

ODDEN, JOHN, Liversedge, Yorkshire, Innkeeper. Oct 26 at 11. Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Hatley.

OLDIE, EDWARD CHARLES, and ALBERT JOHN OLDIE, Wilson st, Finsbury, Builders. Oct 26 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn.

PARROTTE, JAMES, Clapham rd, Provision Dealer. Oct 25 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn.

FLOWMAN, FREDERIC DAMON, Newport, Mon, House Furnisher. Oct 27 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn.

REDERN, JOHN THOMAS, Ashford, nr Bakewell, Derbyshire, Marble Merchant. Oct 26 at 9. Rutland Arms Hotel, Bakewell.

ROLLASON, ALEXANDER EDWARD, Rochester, Clerk. Oct 17 at 11.30. Off Rec, High st Rochester.

ROWE, WILLIAM CHARLES, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Innkeeper. Nov 3 at 10. Court House, King's Lynn.

SAUNDERS, FRANCIS WOOLHOUSE, Sandy, Bedford, Saddler. Oct 31 at 12. 8, St Paul's sq, Bedford.

FORIVEN, HENRY, Womensley, Yorks, Farmer. Oct 25 at 2. Red Lion Hotel, Pontefract.

SMITH, JOSEPH JAMES, Maidney, nr Newport, Mon, Builder. Oct 25 at 3. Off Rec, 12, Tredegar pl, Newport.

STEIN, ELIZABETH, St Ives, Cornwall, Fish Buyer. Oct 25 at 12. Off Rec, Bow-church st, Tyro.

THOMAS, JOHN, Saundersfoot, Pembroke, Builder. Oct 26 at 11. Off Rec, Carmarthen.

THOMAS, WILLIAM, Glyn Neath, Glamorgan, Coal Merchant. Oct 25 at 2.30. Castle Hotel, Neath.

UPTON, EDWARD, Narborough, Leicester, Coal Merchant. Oct 25 at 12.30. 25, Filar lane, Leicester.

WILLIAMS, ROBERT, Morfa, Nevin, Carnarvon, Mariner. Nov 3 at 11.15. Queen's Head Cafe, Bangor.

WOOD, G T, Miles lane, Oct 26 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Lincoln's inn.

WOOD, SYDNEY FREDRICK, Torquay, Tailor. Oct 26 at 11. Off Rec, 13, Bedford circus, Exeter.

YATES, GEORGE, Bath, Printer. Oct 25 at 2.30. 33, Carey st.

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Oct 11.

WHITEHEAD, SMITH, WILLIAM BENNIE WHITEHEAD, and VIRGIL WHITEHEAD, Bradford, Manufacturers. Oct 27 at 11.30. Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford.

ADJUDICATIONS.

RAILEY, FRED, C. line, Lancashire, Warp Dresser. Burnley. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

SARKER, WILLIAM, Charnock-Richard, Lancashire, Innkeeper. Bolton. Pet Oct 20. Ord Oct 14.

SAYES, WILLIAM JOHN, Winchester, Builder. Winchester. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 13.

BRADSHIRE, WALTER EDWIN, Old Kent road, Olmsted. High Court. Pet Aug 31. Ord Oct 14.

EVANS, JOHN, and JAMES EVANS, Swansea, Brokers. Swansea. Pet Sept 27. Ord Oct 8.

GUCKLEY, THOMAS HENRY, Leicester, out of business. Leicester. Pet Oct 1. Ord Oct 10.

HILLS, THOMAS, Bushey Hill road, Camberwell, Draper. High Court. Pet Sept 22. Ord Oct 19.

BIRBECK, W. H., Burslem, Commission Agent. Hanley, Burslem, and Tansel. Pet Oct 6. Ord Oct 14.

BULLER, JOSEPH, Lower Sydenham, Kent, Builder. Greenwich. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 11.

CABLE, JOHN, Weelsby, nr Great Grimsby, Smack Owner. Great Grimsby. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

COX, EDWARD CALER, Milton, Hampshire, no occupation. Southampton. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 13.

FRANCIS, THOMAS, Bridgend, Glamorganshire, Draper. Cardiff. Pet Oct 4. Ord Oct 14.

GRIFFITH, HENRY, Llanfairisger, Carnarvonshire, Contractor. Bangor. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 13.

HARRIS, THOMAS, St Albans, Builder. St Albans. Pet Sept 20. Ord Oct 13.

HUGHES, JOHN ROBERT, Portmadoc, Carnarvonshire, Photographer. Bangor. Pet June 15. Ord Oct 13.

HULETT, W. H., Sandmore rd, Clapham, Builder. High Court. Pet Aug 20. Ord Oct 14.

HUMPHREYS, JOHN JOSEPH, Derby, Fishmonger. Derby. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 10.

HUTCHINSON, ARTHUR, Huddersfield, Warehouseman. Huddersfield. Pet Sept 30. Ord Oct 15.

JACKSON, GEORGE FREDERICK, Leicester, Coal Merchant. Leicester. Pet Sept 2. Ord Oct 10.

JACKSON, JOHN, St Albans, Saddler. St Albans. Pet Sept 13. Ord Oct 13.

JONES, DAVID HOPKIN, Cardiff, Accountant, Cardiff. Pet Aug 17. Ord Oct 14.

JONES, ROBERT WALLER, Brook green, Hammersmith, Retired Lieut-Col. High Court. Pet Aug 31. Ord Oct 14.

KEYSON, JOSEPH, Clacton on Sea, Schoolmaster. Colchester. Pet Sept 24. Ord Oct 14.

KRAUS, FREDERICK, Weston super Mare, Baker. Bristol. Pet Sept 29. Ord Oct 14.

LOVEDAY, CHARLES PERKINS, and JOHN EDWARD EVANS, Swansea, Builders. Swansea. Pet Sept 27. Ord Oct 7.

LOW, JOHN, Rhyl, Innkeeper. Bangor. Pet Oct 11. Ord Oct 13.

LUCKMAN, WILLIAM, Coventry, Fruiterer. Coventry. Pet Oct 14. Ord Oct 15.

MORRIS, DAVID, Maesteg, Glamorgan, Collier. Neath. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

NUNN, EDGAR, Thrandeston, Suffolk, Farmer. Ipswich. Pet Sept 12. Ord Oct 14.

ROLLASON, ALEXANDER EDWARD, Rochester, Kent, Clerk. Rochester. Pet Sept 29. Ord Oct 13.

ROWE, WILLIAM CHARLES, King's Lynn, Norfolk, Innkeeper. King's Lynn. Pet Oct 10. Ord Oct 13.

SAUNDERS, FRANCIS WOOLHOUSE, Sandy, Bedford, Saddler. Bedford. Pet Oct 14. Ord Oct 15.

SCARE, MATTHEW, Weston, nr Patrington, Yorks, Farmer. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Oct 13. Ord Oct 13.

SPARLING, HENRY, Bury St Edmunds, Commercial Traveller. Bury St Edmunds. Pet Sept 28. Ord Oct 14.

STEPHENSON, FREDERICK GEORGE, Nottingham, Grocer. Nottingham. Pet Sept 23. Ord Oct 15.

STICK, NICHOLAS, Buntingford, Herts, Farmer. Cambridge. Pet Sept 23. Ord Oct 14.

THOMAS, WILLIAM, Glynneath, Glamorgan, Coal Merchant. Neath. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 14.

TOMLIN, THOMAS ARTHUR, Sheffield, Watchmaker. Sheffield. Pet Oct 8. Ord Oct 14.

TRANTER, THOMAS, Hereford, Gardener. Hereford. Pet Sept 23. Ord Oct 13.

UPTON, EDWARD, Narborough, Leicester, Coal Merchant. Leicester. Pet Sept 24. Ord Oct 10.

WOOD, SYDNEY FREDRICK, Torquay, Tailor. Exeter. Pet Oct 12. Ord Oct 15.

WRIGHT, HENRY, Southampton, Lead Merchant. Southampton. Pet Sept 29. Ord Oct 13.

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Sept 20.

HUDSON, CHARLES JAMES, Oxford, Licensed Victualler. Oxford. Pet Aug 17. Ord Sept 14.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BOYER.—Oct. 13, at Alkham-road, Stoke Newington, the wife of Edward Lawrence Boyer, solicitor, of a son.

MUNDAY.—Oct. 17, at Langley-avenue, Sarbiton-hill, the wife of John H. Munday, solicitor, of a daughter.

PARIS.—Oct. 13, at Southampton, the wife of Alexander Paris, solicitor, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

HAUGHTON—WOOD.—Oct. 10, at Dunganstown, county Wicklow, William Haughton, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, to Elizabeth Susan O'Connell, widow of William Edward Wood.

LITTLE—GRAHAM.—Oct. 12, at Barnes, Frederick Arthur Little, solicitor, to Katharine, daughter of H. W. Graham, of Barnes.

SNOW—BINNS.—Oct. 12, at Southport, Arthur Snow, solicitor, 25, Lincoln's-inn-fields, to Louise, daughter of the late Thos. Walpole Binns, of White Lee House, Yorks.

DEATHS.

JAMESON.—Oct. 12, at Thornhill-square, N., Mark Jameson, of Gray's-inn, aged 67.

ROBERTS.—Oct. 18, at Upper Montague-street, Russell-square, Philip Roberts, of South-square, Gray's-inn, aged 77.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity, in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPIC	751	CORONERS' INQUIRIES	757
VERDICT'S LIABILITY FOR DETENTION OF THE PURCHASED PROPERTY	752	LAW SOCIETIES	758
IS COMPULSION REALLY NECESSARY FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF REGISTRATION OF TITLE?	753	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	759
REVIEWS	755	LEGAL NEWS	760
		COURT PAPERS	761
		WINDING-UP NOTICES	762
		CRADDOCK'S NOTICES	763
		BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	764
		PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES	765

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

FIRE!! BURGLARS!! JOHN TANN'S

"ANCHOR RELIANCE"

SAFES

FOR JEWELLERY, PLATE, DEEDS, BOOKS, &c.

SOLICITORS' DEED BOXES.

FIRE RESISTING SAFES, £4 10s., £5 5s., and £8 5s.

LISTS FREE.

11, NEWGATE ST., LONDON, E.C.

LAW.—Open Competitive Examination for the Situation of Supplementary Clerk in the Solicitor's Office of the Inland Revenue Department, &c. (19-30), 8th November.

The date specified is the latest at which applications can be received. They must be made on forms to be obtained, with particulars, from the SECRETARY, Civil Service Commission, London, S.W.

TO SOLICITORS and Others.—Any person having in his possession a Lease, dated 1st January, 1815, made between Lord Darnley and Messrs. Wilkinson & Spurray, of Premises situate at Finsbury Market, E.C., is requested to forthwith Communicate with Messrs. FITTS & SAVAGE, Solicitors, 57 and 59, Ludgate-hill, E.C.

THE SOCIETY OF ACCOUNTANTS and AUDITORS. (Incorporated 1884.) The Fellows and Associates of this Society practice in all parts of the United Kingdom, and are styled "Incorporated Accountants." Lists of the Members and all information may be obtained upon application to the Secretary. By order of the Council.

JAMES MARTIN, Secretary.
Office: 3, Newgate-street, London, E.C.

WANTED, in the Country, by a thoroughly experienced and a man of good education and address, a Situation as Accountant, Cashier, or in other responsible position, in a Solicitor's or Land Agent's Office; has had, both in London and Country, the entire management of House Property, Collection of Rents, Interest, Tithes, Insurance, &c., and the rendering of the Accounts relating thereto; first class testimonials and security.—K., 8, Coldstream-terrace, Camelford.

CASHIER, or other Confidential Position (not legal) in a Solicitor's or other office; long experience in the collection of rents and management of house property; thoroughly reliable in every way; varied business experience; well understood book-keeping; unexceptionable references.—Address, J. K., care of Coombes & Co., 10, Paternoster-square, E.C.

TO ADVOCATES and PUBLIC SPEAKERS.—A Graduate of Oxford (formerly Scholar of Trinity and Member of Lincoln's Inn), will commence Lectures the first week in November on the Production and Management of the Voice, with especial reference to Advocacy. Fee for the course, Five Guineas.—Address, ADVOCATE, care of the Manager, Bloomsbury Hall, Hart-street, W.C.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE  MAKERS,

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,
To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY AND CLERGY GOWNS
ESTABLISHED 1620.

94 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

THE LAW REPORTS (Second-hand).—A fine set, complete, half calf, 1866 to 1886 inclusive, with Digests; good as new.—S. R., 27, Fleet-street, London, E.C.

IF you want Money without Fees—amounts £10 to £1,000—before applying elsewhere see Mr. O. CLIBURN, personally if possible, 43, Great Tower-street.

BOOKS BOUGHT.—To Executors, Solicitors, &c.—HENRY SOTHERAN & CO., 136, Strand, and 26, Piccadilly, PURCHASE LIBRARIES or smaller collections of Books, in town or country, giving the utmost value in cash. Experienced valuers sent. Removals without trouble or expense to sellers. Established 1816. Telegraphic Address, "Bookmen, London."

HOME for the TREATMENT and CURE of INEBRIETY and MORPHIA HABIT, High Shot House, Twickenham. — Charming scenery. Gentlemen only. Limited number taken. Billiard room, library, lawn tennis court, bowls, &c. The whole staff pledged abstainers. Terms—2s. to 5 guineas weekly. — Particulars from the Medical Superintendent, H. BRANTHWAITE, F.R.C.S. Ed.; and reference is permitted to Messrs. MUNTON & MORRIS, Solicitors, 96A, Queen Victoria-street, London.

MEDICAL CARE and SUPERVISION.—A married Physician Offers a comfortable Home near the Sea (cool in summer, warm in winter); pleasant grounds, tennis, sea baths; terms moderate. —Dr. HELLAS, Mountfield, Bonchurch, Isle of Wight.

EDUCATION.—To Solicitors and other Professional Men and Gentlemen of Limited Income.—A few boys, sons of the above, are admitted into a well-known School of high tone on greatly reduced fees.—For full particulars address, in strict confidence, "M.V." care of Messrs. Relfe Bros., 6, Charterhouse-buildings, Aldersgate, City, E.C.

MADEIRA.—REID'S HOTELS.—Splendid Climate; every comfort for Visitors; short sea passage. Santa Clara under new management.—Apply to WILLIAM REID.

LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and **LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.**—No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.

HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent, begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of forty years, in the special insertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured. Official stamped forms for advertisement and file of "London Gazette" kept. By appointment.

UNTEARABLE LETTER COPYING BOOKS.

(HOWARD'S PATENT.)

1,000 Leaf Book, 5s. 6d.

500 Leaf Book, 3s. 6d.

English made.

THE BEST LETTER COPYING BOOK OUT.

WODDERSPOON & CO.,

7, SERLE STREET, AND 1, PORTUGAL STREET,
LINCOLN'S INN, W.C.

MILNER'S SAFES.

MILNER'S Strong, Holdfast, & Fire Resisting Safes & Banker's Strong Rooms.

MILNER'S DEED BOXES	2 s.
For Lawyers	from 4 s.
MILNER'S SAFES	
For Lawyers, specially fitted with japanned boxes	from 8 s.
MILNER'S SAFES	
For Books and documents	8 s. 10
MILNER'S SAFES	
For Church Plate	10 s.
MILNER'S SAFES	
For Jewellery	16 s. 10
MILNER'S SAFES	
For Registrars, specially fitted	16 s.
MILNER'S SAFES	
For Bankers	52 s.
MILNER'S SAFES	
For Diamonds	68 s.
MILNER'S SAFE DEPOSITS	5,000

ILLUSTRATED DRAWINGS AND ESTIMATES FREE BY POST.

MILNER'S, 28, Finsbury-pavement, E.C.
MILNER'S, 28, Market-street, Manchester.
MILNER'S, 8, Lord-street, Liverpool.
MILNER'S, Phoenix Safe Works, Liverpool.

FURNISH your HOUSES or APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT on MOEDER'S HIRE SYSTEM.

The original, best, and most liberal. Founded A.D. 1859. Cash prices. No extra charge for time given. Particulars, estimates, Press opinions, testimonials post-free.

F. MOEDER, 248, 249, and 250, Tottenham-court-road, and 19, 20, and 21, Morwell-street, W. Established 1852.

ALSO for HIRE ONLY.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

For the Relief of Poor and Necessitous Solicitors and Proctors in England and Wales, and their Wives, Widows, and Families.

The FIFTY-NINTH HALF-YEARLY GENERAL MEETING of the Members of this Association will be held at the GRAND HOTEL, EASTBOURNE,* on Wednesday, the 26th inst., at 12 noon:—To receive from the Board their usual Half-yearly Report; to elect Directors and Auditors for the ensuing year; and to transact other general Business.

9, Clifford's-lane, London, E.C., October 3rd, 1887.

JAMES THOMAS SCOTT, Secretary.

* For the convenience of Members wishing to leave Eastbourne by the Evening Trains, an early Dinner will be provided at the Grand Hotel at 5 p.m., at a charge of 10s. 6d. per head (exclusive of wine). Gentlemen who may desire to dine, will please send their names to RICHARD PINCOCK, Esq., Solicitor, Spencer House, Eastbourne, on or before FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21st.

R

de.
T.

ET.

ist-

.

2 2

4 8

8 0

8 19

19 8

16 10

18 0

52 6

68 4

000

REE

.C.

ester.

rpool

ART-

on.

oniale

court-

Etate-

N.

2, 2

msung

ry.

otel at

mpoon.